LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES

The Library of Congress

	X	RECEIVED & FILED
IN THE MATTER OF:)	
) Docket No.	MAY - 8 2018
DETERMINATION OF CABLE) 14-CRB-0010-CD	COPYRIGHT ROYALTY BOARD
ROYALTY FUNDS) (2010-2013)	
	X	

CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT WITH KEYWORD INDEX

Pages: 4400 through 4608

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: April 24, 2018

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 206
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 628-4888
contracts@hrccourtreporters.com

	rermination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket N 4400	10.1	4-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 201
1	UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES	1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	The Library of Congress	2	On behalf of Program Suppliers:
3	The hibiary of congress	3	GREGORY O. OLANIRAN, ESQ.
		4	LUCY HOLMES PLOVNICK, ESQ.
4	IN THE MATTER OF:		•
5) Docket No.	5	ALESHA M. DOMINIQUE, ESQ.
6	DETERMINATION OF CABLE) 14-CRB-0010-CD	6	ALBINA GASANBEKOVA, ESQ.
7	ROYALTY FUNDS) (2010-2013)	7	DIMA BUDRON, ESQ.
8	X	8	Mitchell Silberberg & Knupp LLP
9	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE SUZANNE BARNETT	9	1818 N Street, N.W., 8th Floor
0	THE HONORABLE JESSE M. FEDER	10	Washington, D.C. 20036
1	THE HONORABLE DAVID R. STRICKLER	11	202-355-7917
2		12	
3	Library of Congress	13	On behalf of Public Television Claimants:
4	Madison Building	14	RONALD G. DOVE, Jr., ESQ.
5	101 Independence Avenue, S.E.	15	DUSTIN CHO, ESQ.
6	Washington, D.C.	16	ROBERT N. HUNZIKER, JR., ESQ.
7	April 24, 2018	17	Covington & Burling LLP
8	APILI 24, 2010	18	One CityCenter
9	0.41	19	850 Tenth Street, N.W.
	9:41 a.m.	1	
0	VOLUME XX	20	Washington, D.C. 20001
1		21	202-662-4956
2		22	
3	Reported by: Joe W. Strickland, RPR, CRR, CRC	23	
	Karen Brynteson, RMR, CRR, FAPR	24	
4		25	
25		ļ	
_	4401	,	440
1	APPEARANCES:	1	APPEARANCES (Continued):
2	On behalf of Joint Sports Claimants:	2	On behalf of Canadian Claimants Group:
3	ROBERT ALAN GARRETT, ESQ.	3	L. KENDALL SATTERFIELD, ESQ.
4	M. SEAN LAANE, ESQ.	4	Satterfield PLLC
5	DANIEL A. CANTOR, ESQ.	5	1629 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
6	MICHAEL KIENTZLE, ESQ.	6 .	Washington, D.C. 20006
7	BRYAN L. ADKINS, ESQ.	7	202-355-6432
8	Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP	8	
9	601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.	9	VICTOR J. COSENTINO, ESQ.
0	Washington, D.C. 20001	10	Larson & Gaston, LLP
1	202-942-5000	11	200 S. Los Robles Avenue, Suite 530
2		12	Pasadena, CA 91101
3	IAIN R. McPHIE, ESQ.	13	626-795-6001
ა 4	Squire Patton Boggs LLP	14	020 750 0001
4 5	2500 M Street, N.W.	15	On behalf of Settling Devotional Claimants:
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		•
6	Washington, D.C. 20037	16	ARNOLD P. LUTZKER, ESQ.
7	202-626-6688	17	BENJAMIN STERNBERG, ESQ.
В	On behalf of Commercial Television Claimants:	18	Lutzker & Lutzker LLP
9	JOHN I. STEWART, Jr., ESQ.	19	1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 703
0	DAVID ERVIN, ESQ.	20	Washington, D.C. 20036
	ANN MACE, ESQ.	21	202-408-7600
1	,	22	
	Crowell & Moring LLP	66	
1 2 3	Crowell & Moring LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.	23	
	Crowell & Moring LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004		

Det	termination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket	No. 14	4-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 20	18
	4404		4406	
1	APPEARANCES (Continued):			İ
2	On behalf of Settling Devotional Claimants:	1	Baseball, Vicky Loughery from the National	
3	MATTHEW J. MacLEAN, ESQ.	2	Football League, and our co-counsel,	
4	MICHAEL A. WARLEY, ESQ.	3	Mr. Hochberg.	
5	JESSICA T. NYMAN, ESQ.	4	JUDGE BARNETT: Let me say what I said	
6	Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP	5	at the end of the hearing, in case I forget at	
7	1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W.	6	the end of the Closing Arguments. I want all	
8	•	7	the clients who are here to know how well	
9	Washington, D.C. 20036	8	represented you have been. You have fine	
	202-663-8183	9	lawyers, all of you. Go ahead.	
10		10	MR. GARRETT: Would you like to	
11		11	elaborate, your Honor?	
12		12	JUDGE BARNETT: They should be paid a	
13		13	bonus.	
14				
15		14	JUDGE STRICKLER: The devil is in the	
16		15	details. Maybe quit while you're ahead.	
17		16	MR. GARRETT: You're absolutely right,	
18		17	your Honor.	
19		18	I said good morning. Let me start by	
20		19	noting, as you well know there are five studies	
21		20	that are in the record here each of which is	
22		21	intended to show the relative marketplace value	
23		22	of the Joint Sports Claimants category, as well	
24		23	as other categories. The Bortz survey puts the	
25		24	JSC share at 38.2 percent. And Ms. McLaughlin	
		25	for Public Television has adjusted that to	1
	4405		4407	Ĩ
1	, n n o c m m n t M c c		incline Feether pmy and and Canadia and and	
1	PROCEEDINGS		account for the PTV-only and Canadian-only and	
2	(9:41 a.m.)	2	her adjustment brings the Sports' share to 36.6	
3	JUDGE BARNETT: As you well know it is	3	percent.	:
4	the date and time for the Closing Arguments in	4	Dr. Israel, a Joint Sports Claimants	
5	the allocation phase of Cable Distribution for	5	witness, did a regression and he put the Joint	1
6	2010 and 2013. And we understand that or we	6	Sports Claimants' share at 37.5 percent.	
7	have adopted by order the agreement of the	7	Dr. Crawford on behalf of the Commercial	
8	parties we've adopted by order the agreement	8	Television Claimants has also done a regression	:
9	of the parties regarding the order of	9	that puts the Joint Sports Claimants at	
10	presentation Closing Arguments and the time	10	31.5 percent.	
11	limits. And we're beginning with the Sports	11	The Horowitz surveys are at	
12	Claimants. And Mr. Garrett, are you the	12	30 percent. Our view is that no weight should	:
13	spokesperson?	13	be given to the Horowitz survey. But if you	
14	MR. GARRETT: Yes, your Honor, I am.	14	do, you should correct for the flaws and as I	
15	JUDGE BARNETT: Are you reserving any	15	will point out later on, if you do correct for	
16	time for rebuttal?	16	the flaws it brings the Joint Sports Claimants	
17	MR. GARRETT: Yes, your Honor;	17	share very close to what it is in the Bortz	
18	15 minutes of the one hour, please.	18	survey.	
19	JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. Then let's	19	Obviously, the outlier here is the	
20	begin.	20	Gray viewing study and that has us at	:
21	CLOSING ARGUMENT OF JOINT SPORTS CLAIMANTS	21	2.9 percent, that is 27 percentage points less	
1		22	than what the Program Suppliers' other study	
1//	MR (GARRETT) • (GOOD MORDING, VOUR	122	citati nitat cito eloquam pappilitoro ottici beady	
22	MR. GARRETT: Good morning, your	23		
23	Honors. I'm Bob Garrett for the Joint Sports	23	shows, is the Horowitz survey	
		23 24 25		!

here with regard to any of the particular methods by which relative market value can be determined? Or are you saying that we are supposed to put some weight in some fashion --

that I am not quite sure of -- on the prior determinations of fact as opposed to law?

MR. GARRETT: I don't think it is a purely de novo review hearing. But I do think you have to ground your decisions on the record in this case. And if the record is different than what it has been in other cases, then you will act accordingly and I understand that.

But I ask that you also look at this through the prism of what Congress intended when they adopted the law that created the Copyright Royalty Board, which is that they were trying to get to a system where there was going to be consistency. There was concern about the consistency from various separate, independent CARPs being appointed and they felt that — that's not their only objective, but it was certainly a primary objective in creating the Copyright Royalty Board. To have consistency.

This system that we have with

empirical evidence in the record supporting Dr. Gray's theory that relative viewing equals relative value for any programming category.

Second is that the empirical evidence that is in the record, the hard data that is in the record, shows that is wrong, that relative value does not equate with relative viewing.

And third, there is really no record basis here for departing from past precedent in the allocation phase proceedings, which established that unadjusted viewing does not provide a measure of relative marketplace value.

JUDGE STRICKLER: I think you used the word "precedent" a moment ago. Are you saying that factual determinations — this has come up in a number of the proposed findings and responses — that factual findings that were made by our predecessors should constitute precedent, as opposed to just law constituting precedent?

MR. GARRETT: I think the statute says, your Honor, that the Judges shall act on the basis of prior rulings, determinations of the Judges as well as their predecessors. That

has been a prior ruling. In fact, two prior rulings, one by the Judges, one by the CARP and the Librarian, that make it clear that unadjusted raw viewing data does not constitute relative marketplace value.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Are you saying that we don't need to think about it anymore? We should just simply apply that principle from prior determinations? Or we still have to analyze it and determine whether there is fact and reasoning as it pertains to the viewing, or as it pertains to any of the other methodologies and decide them on their own merits based on the evidence here?

MR. GARRETT: You are definitely right, your Honor, that we have to look at the record here. That is why I led with the points that when we look at the record here we do not see any hard data, any empirical evidence showing that relative market value equals relative viewing, and relative viewing equals relative market value. And the evidence that we do have shows to the contrary.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Are you saying it is a de novo review of the evidence as it exists

compulsory licensing where every year you are potentially thrown into another dispute here will become unworkable if each time the same set of issues and the same set of facts comes before the decision maker, there is going to be a different ruling.

JUDGE STRICKLER: But there was a time when viewing was considered in the Phase I or now allocation phase where viewing was considered to be the appropriate measuring tool or a favorite measuring tool, and that fell out of favor. So there was a lack of consistency before that got us to the point where more recent determinations were reliant more so on surveys. And you are saying now we should not ratchet that because consistency is important, but it was inconsistency that got you to the point that you are at right now.

MR. GARRETT: I don't think there was inconsistency, your Honor. And I think the evolution of going from viewing to the surveys is one that took place over a three-decade period. In the very first proceeding where viewing was adopted was a 1979 proceeding. I remember like it was yesterday, unfortunately.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4412

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

4414

```
(Laughter.)
         MR. GARRETT: And at that point in
time in Copyright law, the Tribunal said that
the viewing study is the single most important
piece of evidence in the record. All the
parties in this proceeding here, save for the
Program Suppliers, spent the next two to
three decades trying to show why that
conclusion was wrong. They got away with it in
the first proceeding, but over time people
presented evidence, a lot of evidence, to show
that there is no relationship -- no one-to-one
relationship between viewing and value.
```

And what I'm saying here is that when you look at the record of -- oh, and during that period it was not that one day Judges, or the Judges' predecessors said: The last proceeding, viewing was the single most important piece of evidence in the record; today it's not. There were several proceedings that were litigated. There was a lot of evidence that was produced in those proceedings, some of which is part of the record here, too. And gradually, what the Judges did -- I should say the Judges'

witnesses, who all disagree with that view. Even the Program Suppliers' own 1:47, Ms. Hamilton, acknowledges that there is no one-to-one relationship between viewing and value.

Now, it is of course the Judges' prerogative here to weigh that testimony. And the fact that we've got ten people on one side and they have one economist on one side saying that viewing is a value, you weigh that. But again, I ask you that when you do weigh that look at the fact that there is no hard data, there is no empirical evidence, showing that relative viewing equals relative value.

If we could go to the next slide. The other important point to consider is that there is hard data. There is empirical evidence in this record here. It directly contradicts Dr. Gray's theory, at least for JSC's programming.

So I want to go through some of it, and we will start here with the slide that I' think you saw during the course of the hearing. This comes from Dr. Israel's study where he looks at the cable network marketplace. And as

4415

predecessors did -- was to accord less and less weight to viewing, because of these conceptual difficulties that I recall.

But also because a stronger record had been built up for the support of something like attached to some survey and the use of that methodology. We get it. Nielsen. Okay? Everybody has heard of Nielsen. Bortz. I suspect nobody, until they get into this proceeding, has heard of Bortz. But he lives in the industry where we are focused. Okay?

There are real problems with Nielsen and a company like Bortz, who can stay in this business over three decades doing market research for some of the top names and top clients in the industry, have developed a reputation of producing quality solid market research.

But what I want to emphasize again is that you have Dr. Gray's theory that relative viewing equals public and market value. But you have no hard evidence, no empirical data supporting that. You have a number of witnesses from several of the parties, some economists, some industry folks, some other

the slide shows, it's limited -- this particular one is limited to TBS, which is significant, because TBS was really the first superstation. It was the prominent major distant signal.

And you will see that TBS went out in the marketplace and they bought JSC programming: and that programming accounted for 1.95 percent of the total programming hours that TBS programmed that year, or volume, roughly 2 percent of volume.

JUDGE BARNETT: And that would be the sports telecasts that fit within the definition --

MR, GARRETT: Yes, your Honor. Baseball and basketball. It was 2 percent. Dr. Israel calculated the share of viewing hours, following much the same, approach that Dr. Gray did. And he totaled them up and then you see that JSC programming accounted for just under 6 percent, or 5.52 percent. But yet, as Dr. Israel found, TBS spent over 44 percent of

23 its programming budget on just that JSC 24 programming and the other 56 percent went to programming that constituted about 98 percent 25

adopted the 3.75 rate. They relied on, at least in part, analogies to the cable network marketplace.

If you go more recently in time when a CARP established the satellite carrier rate, the 119, the only rate adjustment we have had under the Section 119 license, in that case they too relied upon cable networks. And they adopted a rate that essentially was the same license fee that was being paid by the top 12 cable networks. Ms. McLaughlin, who testified before you here, was the one who presented that particular analysis.

So there certainly is -- I won't use the word precedence, but between Mr. Haminov's testimony and what has been done in the past to show that we can get some good information by looking at the cable network marketplace.

And we can also say when you look at the cable network marketplace, that as I understand it is sort of the basis for this hypothetical marketplace that we are talking about here. That's what everybody says. You're not going to have Copyright Owners dealing directly with cable systems. You're

that they used to fill out their lineup there.

So assume you had a compulsory license that would allow TBS to acquire all of the programming it acquired during this period, 2010-2013, and your job was to allocate royalty payments that they made between JSC and non-JSC programming. But Dr. Gray would tell you that that 1.95 percent is an imperfect measure of relative marketplace value.

Well, it is a very imperfect measure, because the relative market value is 44 percent, or over 40 percentage points higher. But Dr. Gray would also tell you that the real relative marketplace value of that TBS programming is 5.52 percent. That's what its viewing share is. But that would be wrong. We know that from hard data, empirical data that Dr. Israel developed.

Let me just emphasize that no one has controverted those data here. No one has said you got these numbers wrong. That is not what happened. This information that was put in as part of our direct case, part of Dr. Israel's testimony.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Isn't it

controverted not with regard to the data, but with regard to the analogy that his argument is that TBS during this time period, retransmission of distant programming is not analogous to the market in question that we are grappling with?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, the only person who addressed this is Dr. Gray in his rebuttal and he dismisses it by saying: It is irrelevant. It doesn't really show us.

A couple of things about that. First of all, Program Suppliers themselves in the last proceeding put on a Mr. Haminov -- whose testimony is also in the record of this proceeding here -- who focused on the top 25 cable networks. He didn't do this analysis, but he did other analyses showing how relevant the cable network marketplace is as to the kinds of issues that were before the Judges at that time. All right? So you have Haminov's testimony.

In addition, if you go back -- and this is many years, but unfortunately I remember this one too. This is the 3.75 proceeding where the Copyright Royalty Tribunal

going to have a Copyright Owner who is going to
deal with, in our hypothetical marketplace,
broadcasters. But here they deal with TBS,
which packages together the programming. And
then they go out and license it to their cable
system clients. Okay?
This analogy, too, is even more

This analogy, too, is even more significant because we have this debate: In this hypothetical marketplace, are we to have advertising inserted or not? Well, our view is not. Okay? And that, I think, comes through with the testimony of Ms. McLaughlin, Public Television. We think that you should be distributing these royalties here assuming the same set of conditions, the same kinds of restrictions, the same terms that are in the compulsory license.

But as you can see with TBS, which doesn't insert advertising and does allow its cable system clients to insert advertising, this is the kind of ratio you are getting.

The other I think I would say in answer to your question about is this the wrong marketplace, I think that point that Dr. Gray offers sort of misses the point. What this

(202) 628-4888

18:

19 |

20

21

22:

23:

are typically a multiplicative --

JUDGE BARNETT: Multiplicative?

economist. And then he goes on and the second

quote is from the academic research that he has

MR. GARRETT: I can't talk like an

JUDGE BARNETT: But, Mr. Garrett, what

multiplicative --

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mention, go to the next slide. This was a

Claimants' case -- and what it shows,

Stata graph that was not part of our case -- it

was actually part of the Commercial Television

Dr. Crawford -- for this proceeding, but also

in his academic research where he worked with a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4424

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

the Bortz survey for sports is borne out when you look at what is going on in the marketplace.

Yes, we have a small amount of programming, because or programming tends to be on in prime time and afternoon hours. We don't -- the Program Suppliers, you can pick up those little viewing minutes all day long. You can run your infomercial at 3:00 a.m. in the morning and some NPM household that has nothing better to do might put down one more minute that falls into their bucket.

But ours comes in select patterns, but it is recognized in the industry as extremely valuable programming. And so what you see in these I want to call them benchmarking or analogous marketplaces, is something that both relates to Dr. Gray's theory, and two, shows that the results of the Bortz study -- not only the results of the Bortz study, but both the regressions, the Israel regression and the Crawford regression, they show the same thing.

JUDGE BARNETT: And does this funnel through to that very tiny percentage of programming that is distantly referred to here

they pay for programming doesn't really have any influence whatsoever over what they pay in royalties, because those are measured by distant signal equivalents; right?

MR. GARRETT: Yes, your Honor, that is correct. But --

JUDGE BARNETT: So draw the analogy to that.

MR. GARRETT: I think we all agreed that royalties here should be allocated the way they would be in a free marketplace. That's what we're trying to get at. What is the relative marketplace value of the different categories of programming.

And what you see from the evidence that I presented, there is a functioning marketplace. There we have buyers and sellers getting together. They are buying JSC programming and buying other kinds of programming and this is what you see, the kinds of ratios. And what you see is that it is not something that is determined -- or that value -- or that viewing that equates to relative value. That's what's going on in the real marketplace where you don't have proceedings

in the same proportion. 1 2

MR. GARRETT: Yes, and what we're saying, your Honor, is that if you look at in the marketplace there, it's a very tiny percentage of JSC programming that is on TBS or on TNT, certainly in the top 25 of cable.

Ms. Hamilton came in and said she had a budget for sports of somewhere between 35 and 40 percent. Well, think about that. Cable systems carry hundreds of channels. Hundreds of channels. How much of that is actually sports? It's going to be something in the 1 percent or 2 percent kind of range here. And so we are saying yes.

And incidentally, if we can flip over to slide 10, this is another piece of data that is in Dr. Israel's study where he looks at the amount of the JSC programming in the distant signal marketplace. This is not -- these numbers are not controverted either. He compares it -- it was actually Dr. Crawford who came up with the numbers for the 2010-2013 period and he compares with what Ducey came up with for '04-'05. And as you can see, our share is growing a little bit. We don't make

like this. That's the relationship I'm trying to draw.

And again to get back to the point, your Honor, that when it comes to Dr. Gray's theory that viewing equals value, it's unsubstantiated. And the evidence that you do have in the record, as there has been in many records in the past, is that there is no such one-to-one relationship.

JUDGE STRICKLER: So when you look at the TBS and the TNT analyses that were done, we are really looking at those markets, if I understand you correctly, in the benchmarking context. They're not the market that we are looking at here, but you are saying they are benchmarks in the sense that they are sufficiently analogous -- even though there is advertising revenue that goes into those markets -- but they are sufficiently analogous that we can gain information that we should apply with regard to this regulated market? MR. GARRETT: Yes, your Honor. And

the two critical pieces of information are that, one, viewing does not equal value. And that, two, the kind of ratios that you see in

25

than in Phase I.

To put it another way, I don't think

4428 4430 much of that fact that is that much bigger. It you are bound by what you did in those Phase II 2 is 4.5 to 5.9. But that 5.9 percent is bigger proceedings with respect to viewing, because 3 than what we see on TBS or what we see on TNT there are different considerations. Not only 4 or what we see in the top 25 cable networks. different considerations, but there is a 5 Our point is that we simply have a different record. We have a different record 6 larger share of this distant signal here with the Bortz study, with the 6: 7 marketplace, the one that you have to be regressions, with data like we have here from 7: concerned with, we have a bigger share of that 8 : 8 Dr. Crawford. 9 than we do of the cable network marketplace. I also want to very briefly make the 9, 10 And you see what the kinds of ratios that there 10: point that this is not the case to depart from 11 are there. precedent. And if we could can just pull up 11 12 I jumped ahead before to talking about 12: slide 7. I won't go into all of this in 13 the past decisions. I don't want to say much 13: detail; we have spent a lot of time on it in the course of the hearings. But it's important 14 more about the allocation decisions. I don't 14: 15 want to in any way suggest that you are bound 15: to understand, I think, that this is a very 16 to do exactly what your predecessors did inappropriate case to now switch the allocation | | 17 because they did it. That is not our position. 17 +- from the rulings that have been made in the 18 We tried to put together a record that 18 past. 19 shows why it is wrong to equate viewing and 19. Number one is: The data is wrong. 20 value; why it makes sense that you get results 20 Everybody acknowledges that it is wrong, we've 21 that you do in the Bortz study, in the Israel put in. You cannot rely upon those numbers. 21 . 22 regression, and the Crawford regression. 22 : Dr. Gray's only defense on that is that he 23 We're also not unaware of what you've 23 thinks we are in a, quote, "zone of 24 done in your distribution phase proceedings, 24 reasonableness." And how does he justify that? 25 the Phase II proceedings with respect to 25: He says: Well, the data is wrong because we 4429 4431 1 viewing. And we are not suggesting that you 1: don't have WGNA, which is the most widely 2 need to change that approach simply because we carried distant signal reaching over 40 million 2: 3 don't think you can use it here in the subscribers. We don't have that there, but it 3: allocation phase proceeding. is important for the distant signal marketplace 5 The fact of the matter is that when and hot as great as it once was but there is 5 | 6 you first adopted viewing or looked favorably 6 i less compensable programming. Well, there is 7 7 upon viewing in the 2000 to 2002 Phase II less compensable programming on WGNA, but it is 8 proceeding, you did it primarily by focusing on 8 : the Program Suppliers' programming that is 9 other Phase II decisions. And there was a 9 i less, not ours. 10 theory there that Dr. Gray espoused that, well, 10 When you go to the next slide you see viewing is okay as long as you have got in 2010 -- this is a table that is taken from 11 11 12 homogenous programming. He says in this 12 Mr. Harvey's report. And you can see that 13 13: there is a fair amount of JSC programming on proceeding that his thinking has evolved since 14 then and now he thinks it applies more broadly. 14: WGNA. And it generates a pretty large 15 But whatever that is, the decision was made in 15 audience. That number 143,770, what that is telling you is the number of households who 16 the context of Phase II. 16 17 And when IPG challenged your using 17: watched JSC programs on WGNA during that viewing as a result of -- in the Phase II, the 18 18: 2010-'13 period was twice as big as the number 19 response was: Phase II is different than Phase 19: of households that watched the Program 20 20 Suppliers' programming. So we are a very I. And that's exactly what the Court of 21 Appeals said. There are -- quoting the 21 important part of WGNA and its compensable 22 Librarian's decision in an earlier decision: 22 programming. 23 There are different considerations in Phase II 23: If we go to the Bortz report, which is

24

25 i

Exhibit 1001, page 28, you will see more data

there that really shows how the amount of

programming.

little bit.

Program Suppliers' compensable programming has

gone way down on WGNA. But as the next slide

will show, our numbers of telecast on WGNA has

remained relatively constant, maybe gone up a

don't put WGNA into your viewing analysis,

Program Suppliers very much. And maybe

we're the ones who get hurt. It doesn't hurt

Dr. Gray's justification, he said: Well, the

number of compensable programming is way down.

So what does that mean? Well, if you

misused. It is not being used for the purpose for which it was intended. That is why you get a lot of zeros.

And even putting aside the zeros, you realize that 99 percent of the data that he has is data that reflects either zero or only one household viewing. Just a single household.

There are other problems. Failure to weight, for example. The fact that he says he he's got local viewing data. It's not local viewing data according to Nielsen. NPM does not measure local markets. The data that he does have on the local side is also missing, over 50 percent of the records.

I want to briefly just turn to the Horowitz, unless there are other questions about Nielsen. I have been talking about it for 40 years.

JUDGE BARNETT: It feels like we have been listening to it for 40 years.

(Laughter.)

MR. GARRETT: I feel your pain, your

Honor.

Let's go to slide 11. Again, I won't get into all the details. I think you

Yeah, but it is compensable Program Suppliers' program that is way down. So not putting WGNA is going to depress our share; it's going to inflate their share. And the bottom line is you have the wrong numbers. Everybody acknowledges that. What the record doesn't show is exactly how wrong they are.

Go back two slides. I think other points that we have made throughout here, and again, I'm not going to try to belabor them. But it is wrong to use the NPM database to come up with these estimates. It is a national database for nationally distributed

And I know that the analogies here about left-handed New Yorkers and too many green jelly beans and all of that, and that all makes perfect sense when you are trying to justify the NPM sample, when you are trying to project nationwide viewing from nationally delivered programming, yeah, you are going to get some anomalies here and there. But that does not justify what has been done in this case. A sample has not been selected in order to try to get appropriate viewing measures for regionally distributed programming. NPM is nationally distributed programming.

And we see that when we look at the number of records that Dr. Gray got from Lindstrom that have zero viewing data, or at most only one household viewing. I know that zero viewing data has been an issue in the Phase II proceedings for reasons I think are different from what we have right here, and you resolved that you understood Dr. Gray's explanation that that's bad. But what the zeros tell us, and what our experts have told you, is the reason you are getting those zeros

is because you have got a sample that is being

understand our position on Horowitz, that no weight should be given to that. There are a number of reasons here. The misleading program examples, the improper creation of another sports category, the fact that they do value noncompensable WGNA programming and not making any meaningful efforts to deal with that issue.

In fact, they said, this is the similar to the list that I put it in the opening, it's just that it got a little longer as we went through the hearings here. But another key fact is that they asked their respondents to value programming for which no royalty was being paid, exempt signals, which were in most cases Public Television signals. But not all; Commercial, as well.

Other issues. The biggest issue, and the one that has been a part of these proceedings for several years, is other sports. And here is the difference between the Bortz survey and the Horowitz survey. With the Bortz survey, the argument has always been you asked them to value live professional and college team sports, and they're really thinking about NASCAR. And so they are going to give a value

4436 4438 for NASCAR. Or they are thinking about dan go to the next slide here, our view is that 1 wrestling or something like that. you should not accord any weight to Horowitz: 2 3 There is no -- and never has been any 3 But we do note that the number that you get for evidence that that is in fact what was going sports in Horowitz is within striking distance of the ones that you get from all the other 5 on. And the responsive part, look, with the 5 6 Bortz survey we are trying to get their 6 studies. dominant impression about the signature 7 What Mr. Trautman did, he went through 8 programming. Trying to get the values. That 8 and he just replaced all of the 45 percent of is how it is done in the marketplace. And it's the respondents who carried the WGNA as its 9 9 very unlikely that those kinds of programs, or only distant signal, replaced that with the 10 10 a tennis match or golf, are the ones that are results that you get from his survey, which we 11 11 12 driving the values, in part because there is think is much better. He wasn't giving them 12 13 not much of that in the distant signal 13 examples, he gave them an actual program marketplace. Yes, there is golf. Yes, there summary and told them: This is what programing 14 14 15 is tennis, all on TV. There is NASCAR. Some 15 is in each category. And nobody is thinking 16 of it is on distant signal; a lot of it is on 16 about NASCAR. 17 cable networks or it is on other networks. But 17 And when you meld the two studies 18 the point with respect to Bortz is that that's 18 together with the different groups of 19 what's driving the results here. 19 respondents, you will see that we are still a 20 Horowitz, the difference is that they little short in Horowitz from what we have in 20 21 come in and they affirmatively suggest to the 21 Bortz, but it is a lot closer. 22 22 respondents that: Oh, this is the other sports I think I have two minutes. Let me 23 programming that you're carrying. And forget 23 just -- in two minutes go to slide 13. 24 about -- you can forget about all the 24 With Bortz in the last two 25 25 respondents now, except those that carry WGNA proceedings, the Judges and their predecessors 4439 1 -- over 45 percent of their respondents carried started with the Bortz results and then 2 WGNA only as their only commercial distant adjusted them to account for other kinds of 3 signal. 3 evidence in the record. And that is the 4 And as we have pointed out and our approach that we urge your Honors to follow in 5 witnesses have pointed out in this proceeding, 5 this case, as well, here. 6 that 45 percent of respondents, they carry a 6 I think the important thing to 7 maximum of two hours a year of other sports 7 remember is that we believe that Bortz is going 8 programming. That did not warrant a separate 8 to the right person to get an answer, the cable system operator. They are asking the right 9 category in that survey. 9 : 10 In 2010, aside from the small amount 10 question. This is a methodology they have used 11 of it which we had the Horowitz survey doing 11 for a number of years. They have tried to 12 this saying: All right, here is a horse race. 12 improve it in response to issues raised in 13 It's an example of the kinds of other sports 13 these proceedings, to comments made from programming that is on WGNA. It wasn't an Judges, and continue to do that. 14 14 15 example. It was the only programming. It was 15 It finds corroboration not only in the 16 a one-hour telecast, in two of the years a 16 regressions of Israel and Crawford, but in the 17 30-minute telecast. That is the only sports 17 analogous cable marketplace data that I began 18 18 my conversation with you about. that they get. 19 19 Your Honors, you indicated an interest It is also important to recognize that 20 in these examples -- these are not examples 20 in having individuals with industry experience 21 that Horowitz research came up and said: Yeah, 21 come and testify, at least in one of your Phase 22 they are typical, they are representative. 22 II decisions, and we have done that. We have 23 tried to do it from two perspectives, someone 23 These are examples that were simply fed to them 24 by MPAA and they accepted them unquestionably. 24 who is in the cable system -- a programming executive for a major MSO, and someone who was 25

One thing just to keep in mind, if we

at a satellite operation, DirecTV, competing with cable operators to talk about what they value in the marketplace and why the Bortz results make sense.

So let me end with: Our bottom line is that in the last two proceedings, the decision makers started with a Bortz and adjusted them, and we ask that you do the same thing here. I think if you do, we are going to come up with a number that is pretty close to the one that we had in the Bortz results.

Thank you, your Honors. I will save -- I quess I have 15 minutes left.

JUDGE BARNETT: Mr. Stewart, you're the spokesperson for Commercial Television. Would you like to reserve any time for

Would you like to reserve any time fo rebuttable?
MR. STEWART: I'd like to re

MR. STEWART: I'd like to reserve 15 minutes.

JUDGE BARNETT: Okay.

CLOSING ARGUMENT COMMERCIAL TELEVISION CLAIMANTS

MR. STEWART: Good morning. I am here on behalf of the Commercial Television Claimants. We want to thank you first for your

25 attention throughout these proceedings. We

in detail.

Now, I said in our Opening Statement that notwithstanding the number of witnesses you would be hearing from today, the case from our perspective is going to boil down to your evaluation of these three principal quantitative evidence -- pieces of evidence that are comprehensive in terms of covering all the categories, and they are the Bortz survey, the regression analyses, and the Program Suppliers' so-called viewing study.

We believe the record has been fully developed and that you have the basis in the record for evaluating those two studies. The first two studies provide you the evidence that you need to determine and adopt fully supported allocations decisions in this case.

We think, as Mr. Garrett suggested, that your allocation should ultimately be determined following the same approach that was followed by the Judges in '04-'05 proceeding, which is the most recent allocation phase proceeding.

So the starting point identified by the Judges there was the augmented Bortz survey. We think that will be your starting

hope that the evidence we have provided you you have found both interesting and now helpful as

you turn to the job you have of deciding our allocations.

This morning I'd like first to provide

This morning I'd like first to provide a brief overview of how we see the evidence in this case and the path forward to the allocations.

Next, I'd like to discuss two principal quantitative studies that we'll be urging you to rely on in this case in making your allocation decisions: The Bortz survey and the Crawford regression analysis.

Next, I want to discuss the evidence that has been put in by the Program Suppliers, which we will urge you to give no weight in your decisions. They are the viewing-related study that Dr. Gray has put in and the Horowitz survey.

I'll briefly discuss the approaches taken by the other parties in the proceeding, Canadians, Public Television, and Devotionals.

And finally, I'd like to walk you through the steps of what we would propose as your allocation determinations.

point here, and I will get back to that. And they used the results of a regression study that was also presented by CTV in that proceeding for the basis for making adjustments to the augmented Bortz numbers for the Devotional share, and I will get back to those

Now, for this proceeding we have worked hard to provide you with valid and reliable evidence on which you can base your decisions. We think that there is both good economic theory underlaying those studies and valid methodologies that have been presented.

Based on what we've looked at and what we've tried to do in this year's proceeding, we think that -- and based on comments made by the Judges on our two prior regression analyses -- we believe we've presented what is a substantially improved econometric study. The Bortz survey was also improved in several ways and those have been put in the record by the Sports Claimants.

But from our perspective this is exactly how you would want the process to work and the way it has worked for many years. The

4447

- parties here take seriously the criticisms and 1
- 2 concerns that are identified by the Judges and 3 then they look at those studies and they
- attempt to make improvements to them so that 4
- 5 the next time you have to -- you are called on
- 6 to decide these same allocation issues, you 7
 - have what we have attempted to provide as
- 8 improved evidence.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I think that in this case we have both stronger and more reliable and substantial evidence to support your decisions.

Now let me turn to the principal quantitative studies, the Bortz study and the Crawford regression. In the '04-'05 decision, the CRJs found the Bortz survey the most persuasive piece of evidence. In the same decision, the CRJs found that our Waldfogel regression analysis, presented by Professor Waldfogel, corroborated the Bortz survey, but also provided additional useful independent information about CSO values.

And for each study, as I mentioned, the CRJs identified concerns that they had and issues that had been raised by the parties and they evaluated those issues. In this

them in which communities within their cable 1

- 2: system -- but the substantial increase in the
- 3: data that was available because of this shift
- to subgroups allowed, as well, for the use of a
- fixed-effects approach in the regression. And 5 ·
- 6 : a fixed-effects approach addresses issues of
- 7 unknown variables which had been among the
- 8 criticisms levied by the other parties against
- 9 | prior regressions.
- 10: The ultimate effect of these
- 11: differences and improvements was an elimination
- 12 of the year-by-year or year-to-year volatility
- 13: that parties complained about in the '04-'05
- regression of Dr. Waldfogel and radical 14:
- 15: improvement in the precision of the estimates.
- 16: Unlike the Waldfogel regression results, all of
- 17 : Dr. Crawford's results for the key program
- 18: variables are positive and statistically
- 19 significant for 2010 to 2013.
- 20: Now, in the '04-'05 decision, the CRJs
- 21: also found the regression results useful
- 22 because they independently corroborated the
- 23: Bortz survey results. These regressions asked
- 24 the same question as Bortz, but they asked it
- 25 of the data rather than the cable operators

4445

1

proceeding both JSC and CTV have gone to some lengths to address those concerns and the result is that both of these principal pieces of evidence on which the Judges based their

decision in '04-'05 have become stronger and more reliable for 2010 to '13.

With respect to the regression analysis, we have made a number of improvements. First, we studied all of the distant signal programming over all four years, rather than using a sample.

Second, as a result of STELA, the CSOs began making their distant signal decisions and calculating their royalties based on subscriber subgroups, smaller communities within their broader systems. And that phenomenon produced a variation across subscriber groups, which was usable in the regression analysis in a way that was different from the prior system-based regressions.

The substantial increase in the actual distant signal marketplace data -- because remember, CSOs are not bound to carry or select particular distant signals; they are free to decide which distant signals are valuable to

themselves. The regression analysis was

- straightforward and transparent, based on the 2:
- 3 premise of economic choice measuring all the
- distant signal programming actually purchased
- by the cable operators during the period 5 -
- 6 against the royalties that they actually paid.
- 7 -In this case, the Crawford regression
- was prepared entirely independently of the 8 |
- Bortz survey or the Israel regression, and yet 9 .
- 10 the results are remarkably similar, and similar
- not because they are identical -- which would 11
- 12 be suspicious, if you ask me -- but instead are
- 13. with respect to the rank order of the relative
- 14 values or the relative shares of the top four
- 15. categories out of six, they're the same. With
- 16 respect to the rough magnitude of those shares,
- 17 they're the same.
- 18 And interestingly with respect to the
- 19 PTV and Canadian shares, the Bortz shares are
- 20 lower than for the regression shares, but
- 21 that's in part because of the sort of this
- 22 fundamental design feature of the Bortz survey.
- 23 Because they determined that it would be
- inappropriate to ask systems that carried only 24
 - PTV signals or only Canadian signals to provide

25

4451

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

4448

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to enhance the cable operator's own business interests community by community.

Secondly, you know, Dr. Crawford said in his testimony that he replicated Crawford's regression without the minimum fee systems and came up with wildly different results. That is simply false. As he admitted, he changed the analysis. And I find in Program Suppliers' proposed findings that he said he had to change the analysis entirely to a system-based rather than subgroup-based regression because cable operators pay minimum fees at the system level. But that's nonsense.

All you have to do, and what Dr. Crawford did after seeing his rebuttal, is take the data out. Take the subgroup out for the systems that paid a minimum fee. When Dr. Crawford did that, he arrived at essentially the same results as his initial regression.

So there is evidence that, first, minimum fee systems do make economic choices about the distant signals they carry. And second, at the econometric level, that that difference makes no difference to the ultimate

a relative allocation in a constant sum survey. So they were omitted and they're not omitted from the regression, and so you see that difference and it makes perfect sense. The Devotional share in the regression is lower than in the Bortz survey and that is

the same thing we saw in the '04-'05 case. But given that these studies were performed entirely independently, using entirely different data and entirely different methodologies focused on the same question, attacking the same question from different perspectives, it is truly remarkable that they are as similar -- as comparable as they are. And I think that that -- and this is a question, not a comment by Judge Strickler during the proceeding -- they are mutually corroborative. It does seem that asking the question through the data and asking the

So based on the record as a whole in this case, consistent with prior precedent, the Bortz survey and the Crawford regression are

question through the market participants

arrives at results that are mutually

corroborative.

1 results.

And by the way, Dr. Crawford's regression focuses on the subgroup level and essentially takes all of the distant signal programming across all the distant signals for that particular group of subscribers and then takes the royalties that are actually calculated by the system for that subgroup and compares those two things. All the programs and all of the royalties subgroup by subgroup. And it's not a fee-generated system at all, which is a criticism that others have made.

But in doing so, he does reflect the work that cable operator has actually calculated in terms of what the royalties would be for the subgroup. If the cable operator begins to provide -- acquires additional subgroups, that's a trend that is actually happening, lots more consolidation, then there may be -- then they may go over the minimum

fee, but they still would be calculating their fees and deciding on their distant signals on a community-by-community or subgroup-by-subgroup basis.

So let me turn to the Program

both probative evidence of relative marketplace value.

JUDGE STRICKLER: I'm sorry; one of the criticisms that was levied at all of the regressions that you are citing that come to relatively consistent results -- and I think it was a criticism made by Dr. Gray and made by Dr. Erdem as well -- is that there is no accounting for the fact that there is a minimum fee that needs to be paid, regardless of whether or not the distant signal is being retransmitted. How do you respond to that criticism?

MR. STEWART: Two ways. One, if you look at the example that's given to illustrate that fact in Dr. Gray's own rebuttable testimony, you see a system that has more than 20 subgroups, but that pay the minimum fee. But among those 20 subgroups you see from zero distant signals to 17 distant signals in different communities.

That's a cable operator who is making determinations based on economic interests about attracting and retaining subscribers, and what is important and valuable to subscribers

4452 4454 1 Suppliers, because it's a very different story 1 appropriate for Program Suppliers to have for this set of comprehensive, quantitative withdrawn that study by now. To my surprise, 2 2 3 evidence in the Program Suppliers case. They 3 : Program Suppliers has actually presented 4 needed their so-called viewing study where proposed findings of fact -- just as the first 5 their cable operator survey should be given any 5 one, Proposed Finding of Fact Number 9 -- in which they say that viewing estimates is 6 weight in making determinations. And I say reliable as to all non-WGNA stations and all of so-called viewing, because I want to echo the 8 point that Mr. Garrett made. We have this way 8 the other Gray data in Dr. Gray's analysis as 9 of -- the Program Suppliers have this way of 9 reported in Gray Table 2 is reliable. And 10 providing misleading shorthand. They say 10 Table 2 is the relative viewing shares. Well, Nielsen is synonymous with ratings. They say 11 11 that is simply wrong. 12 viewing is the currency of the realm, and so 12 You know, it's important to note how 13 on. But the viewing they're talking about --13 careful they are in their language. Because and I can tell you this based on my client's they talk about viewing estimates included in 14 14 15 industry -- has nothing to do with what 15 Nielsen's custom analysis provided to Dr. Gray. 16 That's the stuff -- that's the raw data that Dr. Grav has done. 16 17 So for them to wrap themselves in the 17 Mr. Lindstrom provided to Dr. Gray. But when 18 mantle of the viewing that is so important in 18 they then move on to the Table 2, those viewing 19 the broadcast industry, and without explaining 19 shares that Dr. Gray called "expected viewing the differences, say that suggests that their shares," are not reliable and do not have 20 20 21 viewing study should also be used as a measure anything to do with that Nielsen custom study. 21 22 of relative marketplace value is just wrong, 22 Now, Program Suppliers in its filing 23 and we need to be careful about that. 23 on Friday pushed the envelope even farther. In 24 Program Suppliers' approach in this 24 their Proposed Response 62, they say that 25 25 case is just the latest in a long history of Dr. Gray testified about a zone of 4453 4455 1 unsuccessful attempts to try to turn relative 1 reasonableness and caused WGNA's viewing amounts of viewing into relative marketplace 2 contributions to be expected to be a relatively 2 3 value. We strongly believe, and have presented 3 small fraction of total viewing. 4 evidence in this case, and in prior cases for Now, they know, we know, we all know, 4 what actually happens when you bring that WGNA many years, that a viewing study asks the wrong 5 6 question and is simply not relevant to the 6 viewing in. | But your Honors struck that from 7 7 question of marketplace value. this proceeding. The contents of the so-called Now, it would be helpful for you to Third Errata are not fair game in this 8 8 9 adjoin the line of cases that have determined proceeding. 9 10 that it is not relevant in the allocation 10 | | | Solwe should not have proposed 11 phase. And certainly then you would then -responses or proposed findings that suggest 11 12 and we -- would not have to talk about it 12 that if you fixed it, it wouldn't have any 13 anymore, and I'd like that. 13 significant impact. Because that's the same as 14 But we think in this case you may not 14 describing the content of the Third Errata actually need to do that. And that's because 15 15 misleadingly. In any event, Dr. Gray's own testimony in this case the Program Suppliers' evidence is 16 16 17 so defective that you can reject it on that 17 actually confirms the opposite. The 18 basis alone. That the studies themselves are 18 uncorrected results are not usable at all. And simply not usable in this context. 19 at transcript page 3945 in response to my 19 20 20 cross-examination questions about WJZ --So first, the biggest problem: 21 Omitting the WGNA data. Now from our 21 remember, we had the chart that showed that 22 perspective, that alone all by itself renders 22 Dr. Gray's expected viewing was actually a 23 number of households who tuned to programs on 23 the Gray viewing study completely unreliable WJZ as a distant signal was actually less than 24 and invalid. 24

25

In my opinion it would have been

those Nielsen reported actually tuned to WJZ

1 Program Suppliers in 2010; somewhat smaller

programming.

And I didn't understand it at first and he kept after me and insisted that the reason for that mistake is because WGNA had been excluded. And, in fact, then in response to cross-examination from Mr. Cantor in this transcript, 4054 to 4055, Dr. Gray agrees completely that the estimates for all of the stations are ineffective and inaccurate because of the omission of the WGNA data.

That right there is a basis for your giving no weight whatsoever to the relative viewing that MPAA is trying to propose as a measure of relative value, even apart from the questions that Mr. Garrett spent time on and which I have spent time on, as well, since the 1979 proceeding. And we would like to not do that again, but if you prefer you can strike the study on the basis of those errors in the study.

And there are other problems, a number of which are equally independently -- present independent basis for rejecting the study entirely. Even if he included all of the relevant data, the Gray data doesn't meet the

Program Suppliers in 2010; somewhat smaller
increases in 2011 and '12; and produces a loss
in every single year for the Commercial
Television Claimants' share produces a loss in
every single year for the Public Television
Claimants' share. So this is not a comparable
substitute for the Nielsen data that is
actually reported.

And I want to say, as well, that when Program Suppliers argue about the precedent that says that viewing is the most important piece of evidence in the record and that it is an appropriate measure, this, Dr. Gray's study, again, has nothing to do with what they presented in all of those prior years. Because in those prior years they had Nielsen data that measured the actual viewing that was possible to be measured in all of the Nielsen markets and that's what they presented. This isn't even that. And the differences you can see favor Program Suppliers.

Now, this general approach moreover is more that Ms. Shagrin in her decades of work in the audience measurement industry had never heard of anyone using. That is replacing all

standard that was noted by the Judges in the '04-'05 case that any study that is presented to you and purports to provide useful information has been to be reasonably well-founded methodologically.

Dr. Gray's study is not well-founded methodologically. It doesn't use the actual Nielsen data themselves. And, in fact, Dr. Bennett presented this chart, which is his Figure 22, in which he showed what the percentage -- what the difference is if you used Nielsen's actual viewing data to describe the percentages of viewing of the parties, versus what Dr. Gray projected in his regression-based expected viewing, in which he replaced all of the actual reports of viewing with his own predictions. And you see that not only are they different, but this again is just the difference in the percentage in the share points of each of the parties.

And you see that Program Suppliers in following the methodology of Dr. Gray, of not reporting the Nielsen viewing data that was actually measured but instead using Dr. Gray's, produces an increase of 11.98 points for

of the actual Nielsen data with a projection different from the actual Nielsen data.

Dr. Gray himself had no evidence that anyone else had ever done such a thing. And the results that show the bias in favor of Program Suppliers may be a sufficient answer to the question of why they did that.

But Dr. Gray also talked about his rather arbitrary objective of predicting viewing for every single quarter hour of every single program on every single distant signal on every day of every year. Now, I must say that I personally argued about zero viewing in Phase II cases in the 1980s when we represented broadcasters whose programs were syndicated and we were in Phase II with Program Suppliers. And the reason was Program Suppliers reported viewing based on a nonrandom sample of stations and they simply didn't have any of our programs on the sample stations.

And so we argued that you can't do that. You can't have a Phase II case in which the allocation -- the distribution has to be among specific programs, you can't have a Phase II case based on the viewing study that doesn't

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

standard.

7

15

17

18

19:

20 :

21 :

22 .

23:

24

5 :

6:

7 :

8 .

9 :

10

11

12

13:

14

15

16

17

18:

19 :

20

21:

22

23

24

25 :

4462

4463

4460 actually cover enough of the programs. So that's what we were complaining about. 2 . So you might even consider that to be

an issue in today's proceedings, but it's not an issue and should not be the objective in this case. It's nonsensical.

Oh, my. Okay. So we -- I'm just going to say that Dr. Gray's methodology in which he made up local viewing numbers -- he called it imputed -- for stations was in 50 percent of the data for local and 90 percent of the data overall, is fallacious. And so I was going to show you -- those -- the blue marks on this map are the only ones in which there is Local People Meter viewing. All the rest are ones in which there is no local viewing at all.

And let's skip forward. You can take that down and I'll skip over that part.

Just in terms of the other parties, I want to talk about the Canadians. The Devotional and Public Television Claimants don't provide their own studies; they rely on others. But they also each pick a different one and say you should not pay any attention to

Suppliers on WGNA and therefore made adjustments. And they didn't make them in the way that we are proposing that they do. This is the evidence in the record from Exhibit 1002 5: that shows the increase in noncompensable

programs on WGNA for those two categories. 6 . Next slide. This shows the comparison from: -- and this is from Exhibit 2004, 8 : 9. Dr. Crawford's study, the comparison between the total minutes and the compensable minutes. 10 : 11 . And you will see that when you look at these Figures 11 and 12 in Exhibit 2004, you will see 12 . 13 that the difference between the total minutes 14: and compensable minutes for Devotional Claimants and Program Suppliers is very 16 substantial.

> Go to the next slide. This is what we would suggest to use as the other side of the balance, the augmented Bortz survey. That is Dr. Crawford's nonduplicate minutes analysis shares.

And the next slide. So what we would propose -- and this is not what the '04-'05 Judges did -- is that you use in the evidence in the Crawford study, which is more precise

4461

this one at all. Let's look at slide Number 17.

The Judges have said in the past that if you're going to say -- if you are going to persuade the Judges that you should not consider at all a study that has been relied on in prior proceedings, this is the standard that you have to meet. And I would simply say that it is so terribly flawed that it cannot be considered. The prior decision makers got it completely wrong. And neither the Public Television Claimants nor the Devotional Claimants have reached -- have met that

Finally, I'd like to walk you quickly through -- this is presented in our response findings. But if we could go to slide Number 19. These are the augmented Bortz survey shares as presented by -- as calculated by Ms. McLaughlin and this was from Exhibit 1101.

Go to the next slide. These are -and the next one, the '04-'05 Judges made -recognized that there was a problem with the compensable -- the growth of noncompensable programming for both Devotionals and Program

than the Waldfogel study was, as the other side 1 : of the coin essentially in determining how to make the adjustments. 4

So what we have done here is simply show the midpoint between the augmented Bortz share and the Crawford regression share and suggest that would be an appropriate adjusted share for these each of these two studies.

And so then the rest is going to be math. You basically replace them and allocate the difference pro rata between CTV and JSC.

And then the next slide. Then you have to make a further mathematical adjustment to reflect the fact that CTV does not participate in the 3.75. This is in our response findings. But unless there are other questions, I will sit down.

JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.

Let's take a 15-minute recess before we move on to Public Television.

(A recess was taken at 10:58 a.m., after which the trial resumed at 11:20 a.m.) JUDGE BARNETT: Mr. Dove, you are provided for 30 minutes. Do you want to

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 reserve time for rebuttal? 2 MR. DOVE: Yes, ten minutes for 3 rebuttal, please. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. 4 5 CLOSING ARGUMENT OF PUBLIC TELEVISION CLAIMANTS 6 MR. DOVE: Good morning, your Honors. 7 Ron Dove on behalf of the Public Television

Claimants. Your Honor, every party in this proceeding, and every valuation expert, has agreed that the relative value of Public Television's programs has increased from 2004-'05 to 2010-'13. There is no dispute about that. And so the only question from our perspective is how high Public Television's share should be set. So that is what I want to talk about this morning.

Now that all the record evidence is in and all the witnesses have testified, we believe that Dr. Crawford's regression analysis best answers that question because it provides the most accurate shares for all of the

The CARP in the 1998-'99 proceeding predicted that this day would come. They said quote, "best suited" for determining relative marketplace value in these proceedings.

Four of the six parties in this proceeding support using Dr. Crawford's analysis as a measure of relative value in some capacity. And for example, the Commercial Television Claimants state that Dr. Crawford's regression, quote, "provides a valid and reliable basis for determining allocation awards." They state that in their Conclusions of Law.

And Dr. Crawford, your Honors, is the only truly global study. We have seen other slides about global studies, but his study is really the only truly global study in this proceeding. All the other studies leave something out, whether it be PTV-only systems, WGNA programming, an entire year of data, or otherwise require multiple adjustments. So, again, Dr. Crawford's study is the only truly global one.

It's important to remember, I think, your Honors, that the purpose of these proceedings is to determine the relative value of compensable programming actually

4465

4464

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4467

that if the volatility and variability of the Rosston regression analysis are improved, similar analyses may prove useful for directly measuring relative value in future years. For directly measuring relative value.

The Judges then in 2004-'05 agreed. While they noted there were limits to the Waldfogel regression at issue in that proceeding, they stated that those limits largely stemmed from the wide confidence intervals of the coefficients, not from the method itself. The Judges found that conceptually, a properly conducted regression analysis may provide a richer look than the Bortz survey into factors that impact the purchases decision of cable operators.

So we submit, your Honors, that the future that these panels predicted has now arrived.

Dr. Crawford's regression analysis greatly improves on what was done in the past and is far superior to any of the other proposed measures in this case. Indeed, Dr. Crawford himself testified that his

approach is the, quote, "Best method" and,

retransmitted on distant signals. So any methodology how it values or potentially values programming outside of these contours shouldn't be used if there is a better methodology that avoids those pitfalls.

Your Honors have previously held that actual examples of marketplace behavior are far superior to mere testimony regarding perceptions of industry participants. And numerous experts in these proceedings agree with that perspective, Dr. Crawford, Dr. George, Dr. Steckel, Dr. Shum, and Mr. Horowitz, just to name a few.

Dr. Crawford's regression analysis best captures actual observable marketplace behavior. And there are two reasons why it is the best method for awarding shares here, and Mr. Stewart has touched on these, so I will briefly summarize.

First, Dr. Crawford has got the best data. Dr. Crawford -- well, actually Dr. Bennett put together the most comprehensive dataset that has ever been presented in these proceedings. It had all of the programming data on all of the distant signals for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2

7

4470

4471

entire four-year period. Nothing else in this proceeding or in any prior proceeding even comes close.

Second, Dr. Crawford used the best methodology. He used subscriber group data as Mr. Stewart talked about to capture more variation than every before. He had highly effective control measures that even controlled for unobserved factors.

And I think even most importantly here, Dr. Crawford's analysis is very precise with much narrower confidence intervals than any other regression analysis ever presented in these proceedings.

So in other words, Dr. Crawford solved the variability problem that prior panels were concerned about. He solved that. So is Dr. Crawford's study perfect? No, it is not. I mean, as we have all learned sitting in these proceedings, replicating the hypothetical marketplace by its nature involves uncertainty. But it is Public Television's view that based on the evidence in this record, the Crawford analysis is far superior to everything else.

As Dr. Frankel testified in response

1 methodology that gives it less than its highest

possible share. The Bortz surveys give Joint

Sports, Commercial Television, and the 3

4 Devotionals their highest average shares and

that is what they propose. Dr. George gives

the Canadian Claimants their highest share and 6

that is what they propose. And Dr. Gray's

viewing study gives Program Suppliers their 8

9 highest share and that's what they've proposed.

Only Public Television takes the more 10

conservative route in this instance. 11

12 Public Television is also the only 13 party that has proposed a share for each party

14 that does not require adjustment. The other

15 parties leave it to you, the Judges, to figure

16 out how to rescue the data and somehow correct

17 for the various biases that have been

18 identified.

19 The -- what I would call ad hoc

20 adjustments, somewhat arbitrary adjustments

21 that Commercial Television proposes to correct

22 the Bortz survey results illustrates this

23 problem! As we saw Mr. Stewart walking through 24

those and laid out in pages 26 to 29 of their

response paper, it's just rescuing and

4469

25

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to a question from Judge Strickler, data that doesn't need to be edited or rescued is better than data that needs to be edited or rescued.

And so with that in mind, here are the average shares that we propose for all the parties based on Dr. Crawford's initial analysis.

In paragraph 44 and 45 of our Proposed Findings, we report these shares for each year and we adjust them to the basic in 3.75 funds, but this is a summary of shares on the slide.

Now, a few interesting points about these shares. First, under Dr. Crawford's analysis, every party receives a share that is lower than their highest share across all the methodologies presented in this proceeding. So for example Public Television's share of 18.8 percent is significantly lower than the 33 percent share it would receive if the Judges were to adopt Dr. Gray's viewing methodology.

Joint Sports still has the most highly valued programs under Dr. Crawford's analysis, just slightly lower than his Bortz share. One other thing to note is that Public Television is the only party, the only party proposing a

1 correcting for data is just too complex and too 2 arbitrary.

3 We do agree with the Commercial Television Claimants and the Joint Sports

Claimants that the Crawford analysis measures 5

relative marketplace value. We also agree with 6

7 them that the Bortz survey is biased against Public Television and that Public Television's 8

9 shares should be higher in 2010 to '13 than it

10 was in 2004-'05.

> Where we part ways with those two claimant groups, however, is on the fundamental question of whether the Bortz survey is salvageable. In other words, can it be

14 corrected to address its numerous problems? 15

16 They say it can be; we say it cannot be, 17 particularly as to Public Television.

> The record clearly shows, your Honors, that while regression analyses have become more robust and more reliable as the years have gone by, the Bortz survey is going in the opposite direction. It has more flaws than ever before and has never been this biased or unreliable.

And we have prepared a slide that highlights all the various problems with the

4475

4472

1

2

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

comprehensive dataset.

1 Bortz survey. And we don't have time to discuss all of these and they are laid out in 2 great detail in our Proposed Findings and the 3 Proposed Findings of some of the other parties. 4 5 But to summarize, first, Bortz is systematically biased against Public Television 6 7 and is more biased against Public Television 8 than ever before. 9

Bortz discarded more Public Television-only systems in 2010 to '13 than in any previous time period. More than 50, more than 50 in total.

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There was also nonresponse bias this time against Public Television, including a failure to survey any Verizon system that carried Public Television. This was despite the fact that Verizon paid the second most royalties of any MSO and carried many more distant Public Television stations.

Another problem was the amount of compensable programming on WGNA. You know, it fell by half, yet Bortz still didn't identify any noncompensable programming to any survey respondent that carried Public Television.

24 25 Remember, if your system carried only

In the second column the Bortz methodology was also more unreliable and invalid that any before as a methodology. And most importantly, it was far more complex this time around because systems got much larger and subscriber groups were used to carry certain distant signals to certain parts, but not to other parts of the system.

Everyone agrees that the programming decisions were increasingly made at a more centralized level, either regionally or eyen nationally. Which means that for the 2010 to '13 Bortz survey, the respondents were responsible for many more cable systems than they were in the past.

Bortz also changed the warmup questions to talk about experience and cost and changed the wording of the constant sum question, but didn't pre-test any of those changes. So no one knows what the Bortz respondents were thinking when they answered those questions or if they misunderstood the question.

Too many changes. So it's just more

4473

unreliable and invalid than before. 1

> And finally in this proceeding we saw that many of the Bortz responses were demonstrably invalid and unreliable. So we talked about the methodology now, but the responses themselves -- and we laid this out in great detail in our Proposed Findings, pages 59 to 77 -- but just to summarize, we saw that the valuation of movies by respondents that only carried WGNA did not match up with the dramatic changes in the amount of compensable movies on that signal from year to year.

> We also saw, when you actually look at the Bortz responses, that those same respondents valued each hour of live sports programming the same as an hour of Devotional programming at 5:00 a.m. in the morning. That makes no sense, particularly given all the NBA and Major League Baseball programming on WGNA.

> And remember, your Honors, that those respondents that carried only WGNA had an easier task. It's still a very complicated task, but they had an easier task and were given more information than any of the other Bortz respondents, including those that carried

WGNA, the Bortz viewer interviewer gave you a list of program samples and hours of programming. But if you also carried Public Television or some other signal, you got no such list of compensable programming on WGNA. That was only in a special circumstance of WGNA-only systems.

Bortz' Public Television share is also contradicted by all -- all of the other measures in this proceeding, as we can see from this next slide. Ms. McLaughlin tried to correct for one of those biases, the discarded systems, and came up with an augmented Bortz share of 8 percent. But that share didn't address any of the other biases there.

Mr. Horowitz corrected for two -- the first two biases, but still his share of 13.2 percent was too low, because it didn't correct for any of the other biases.

Dr. Israel has a separate problem. He is missing 2013 data all together, which was Public Television's best year.

Only Dr. Crawford fixes each of these biases against Public Television because he uses all of the data available. He has a

4476 (2010 2013)

Public Television.

Finally, your Honors, this next slide shows the Bortz shares for most of the claimant categories are contradicted by both Dr. Crawford and Dr. Israel's regressions. Only sports has Bortz shares that on average are within the Crawford confidence interval and only Sports and Commercial Television have shares from Dr. Israel that fall within the range of Bortz estimates.

So given I have a minute or two left, I just want to say a few words, your Honors, about viewing which has come up with morning. One might wonder what is Public Television's position about viewing. It is a 33 percent share, why wouldn't you be advocating that?

Our position with regard to the viewing study is that there are data problems with the viewing study and we acknowledge those. But it is important to note that there are also major data problems with the Bortz study and the Horowitz surveys, as well. And they all involve the same thing, WGNA; just from a different side of the coin, if you will.

We all know 85 percent of WGNA

1 be the basis for your Honors' awards.

2 And so, unless there are any

questions, your Honors, I will reserve the remaining time for rebuttal and we will go with

5 that.

2.4

JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove.

MR. DOVE: Thank you.

8 JUDGE BARNETT: Who is presenting for

9 Canadian Claimants?

MR. SATTERFIELD: I am.

JUDGE BARNETT: Mr. Satterfield, it's your turn. Would you like to reserve any time for rebuttal?

MR. SATTERFIELD: Yes.

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF CANADIAN CLAIMANTS GROUP

MR: SATTERFIELD: Thank you, your Honors, Kendall Satterfield for the Canadian Claimants. I hate to disappoint; we don't have a PowerPoint presentation.

As you've heard from many parties, we were associated in the past with the fee generation approach. We essentially took the theory that because there are three different types of signals, U.S. Commercial Television, Public Television stations and Canadian

programming is noncompensable. Well, the Bortz and the Horowitz surveys, how do they deal with that? They don't really deal with that adequately. So there are many respondents who could be valuing noncompensable WGNA

programming.

Gray on the other hand, Dr. Gray, that WGNA programming is excluded from his dataset and we could see that that is a problem. But we still think that viewing -- it's relevant to these proceedings. It's just not clear that Dr. Gray's study -- actually that viewing equates to value as has been discussed.

But that said, programming can't have value if it's not being viewed. So we do think it's appropriate to use viewing for corroboration -- as sort of a reality check, if you will, or a zone of reasonableness -- and maybe for adjustments to the extent other studies may not be capturing the whole project.

But, again, all of that aside, our position is that you don't need to do any of that. That the Crawford regression analysis captures all of that in a way never before seen in these proceedings and we propose that that

stations, it would be possible to divide the royalties into three pots.

And we spent a lot of time with this fight. We got the '98 to '99 CARP to more or less adopt that type of approach. But as you are aware, the Copyright Judges in 2003 adopted, because of the unusual structure of that case, but in '04-'05 they chose to treat

9 that as a ceiling for and used Bortz as a

10 floor.

So for this proceeding we were faced with having to come up with a new approach. And having evaluated what Dr. Waldfogel did in 104-105, we chose to take on that as our primary method for determining the value of the Canadian award.

So using that approach, and with the resources that we have available — and we are one of the smallest groups here and we don't have unlimited resources — we chose to develop a regression that was more focused on the unique circumstances of the Canadian Claimants, and that is that our signals by law can only be retransmitted in a narrow geographic strip of the country.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

4480

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 Commercial TV station. And then there are the

1 unique French stations, and French stations are 2 primarily carried in a very small geographic 3

region of the United States where there has 4

been this historically French ancestry. And 5 6 there are still obviously people speaking

French or the cable systems wouldn't continue to carry those stations in those areas. So

those are sort of our unique circumstances.

So it is our view that Dr. Crawford is fantastic, but we would like recognition of the fact that our situation is somewhat unique.

We disagree with the idea of the augmentation of the Bortz study. We have been as a party dealing with the Bortz study for a number of years. We have some insight into constant sum surveys. We have done our own in the past. Ours was different because we asked about programming within signals, we didn't try collapse all the programming across signals.

During this time period, as Public Television pointed out in their closing, the task being put to the cable operators in the Bortz survey was incredibly complex because of the adoption of subgrouping under STELA. So

The thinking that Dr. George developed was that that area is unique from a marketplace standpoint because there is this other type of programming, these other types of signals that are competing in that zone that do not exist anywhere else in the country. That is a unique situation. So a unique market. Obviously, in other local markets there are a multitude of local markets in the country and there are always signals available in those markets. But with the exception of the superstations they are all unique and just focus on the signals around them. So Dr. George developed a

So under her regression, the Canadian Claimants get a higher result than under Dr. Crawford's. Now Dr. George was extremely positive towards Dr. Crawford's efforts in these proceedings, as Mr. Dove just laid out. The study that Dr. Crawford put together was comprehensive. It required a tremendous amount of effort, cost a lot of money -- we are envious of his abilities -- and produced results that applied to all the parties nationwide.

regression that tried to factor this in.

4483 4481

Our approach is that -- our response to Dr. Crawford is it's wonderful; we still think that it ought to be taken into consideration that our segment of the country has a different market component than the remainder of the country. And so Dr. George proposed certain modifications to Dr. Crawford's results.

I mean, we've listened Dr. Crawford's responses, Dr. Israel's responses to that, and can understand that the idea that this puts us in a unique situation. But the fact remains that in this zone, there is a different marketplace. And it runs all the way across the country. There is this unique type of programming that is available.

And I'm not going to tell you that all the Canadian stations are the same. They are not, obviously. There are the CBC stations which are the public broadcaster in Canada. It is much more like a U.S. network station down here, except that it is Canadian programming. And then there are the private broadcasters in Canada that have a substantial amount of U.S. programming and operate much more like a U.S.

suddenly you have multiple little mini cable 1 2 systems all operating together with different 3 cable lineups, television lineups. And somehow 4 or another the person responding is supposed to 5 keep this in mind and if you're a Public 6 Television station or a Canadian station, it's not like -- let me step back. 7

If you were only surveying U.S. commercial stations, if Bortz was limited to U.S. commercial stations the way it was back in the beginning when they first started the Bortz survey, then arguably all you would be focused on is the categories of Joint Sports, Commercial Television, Program Suppliers and Devotionals, which is the programming on those stations.

So whether or not such and such station had more or less or whatever, at least you would be focused on just -- on the collapsing those stations and the programming on those stations. But when you include Public Television and the Canadians, now it is a whole different animal because you have to keep in mind was Public Television station offered to all the subscribers or just some of the

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proceeding.

4487

4484

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

4486

subscribers? Were there multiple Public Television stations to these subscribers and less to these subscribers? And the same with the Canadians. So it's become a very complex task, in our opinion.

And furthermore, as Dr. Conrad testified, the whole thing is premised upon a situation where you are asking for a valuation of these programming categories to these signals, which are completely different. I liked his term: An unnatural category.

If the Bortz study, to put everybody in the same ground, would really to have start off the survey what is it the relative value of the U.S. commercial stations versus the Public Television stations versus the Canadian stations? Now you're asking for the same thing. And then you have to go inside and ask about the programming.

Now, I appreciate that that would make it a much longer, more complicated study. And quite frankly, whether or not it would even be worth it for Joint Sports Claimants or Mr. Bortz -- Mr. Trautman to undertake a study like that. But that is the complexity of the

just some little segment of programming that is included on someone else's signals.

That carriage evidence and the royalty payments is definitely direct evidence of a demand for the Canadian programming. There can't be a doubt; there can't be this idea that, well, when they picked up that signal, they didn't really care about your programming. You were just an afterthought. They pick up our signals. And that fact, in and of itself, is contradictory to the Bortz results. Where Bortz treats us as well under 1 percent, even though the number of systems that carry us, the percentage of subscribers that receive us, the amount of royalty payments paid under the fee generation system, are all substantially higher than those numbers. So in closing, we would urge that in making an award for the Canadians, you start

with Mr. Crawford's regression and take into consideration our arguments and Dr. George's arguments that there should be an upward adjustment.

But we think that would be the fairest outcome for us, and using Dr. Crawford's

4485

complication that is caused by including the Public Television stations and the Canadian

stations in the survey. It's been an issue we've talked about many times. And the Bortz survey was not applied to the Canadians until '04-'05. It was the augmented Bortz was cited as a base for our award. And we think that due to the complexity that's been introduced, that it doesn't make sense to use it as a base for our award in this

Further, the augmentation is entirely dependent on the number of systems that have a Public Television-only or Canadian station-only that were part of the sample. So not very many -- not many of those types of operators got included there is not going to be much augmentation, so you are left with the flawed results of the base survey itself.

As I said, this is something that the Canadians have been dealing with for a long time. We are a small group, we are fairly unique, our programming is on Canadian signals only. Cable operators have to choose to carry our signal to get our programming. We are not

results would then allow an award to be made to all the parties. Thank you.

JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you.

Who is speaking for the Devotionals?

MR. MACLEAN: I am, your Honor.

JUDGE BARNETT: Are you reserving time

for rebuttal?

MR. MacLEAN: I would request

3 minutes, your Honor.

JUDGE BARNETT: In that case, let's take our noon recess. We will take both the Devotionals and Program Suppliers after the break. So return at 12:50. Thank you.

14 (A) recess was taken at 11:52 a.m., 15 after which the trial resumed at 12:58 p.m.)

19 20 21

22 23

24 25

1

2

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4488

AFTERNOON SESSION JUDGE BARNETT: Mr. MacLean, I see you have your three C's up. Just sort of a heads-up, Ms. Brynteson, the court reporter who is to relieve Mr. Strickland, is running a little late. So we might have a break while the court reporters switch out. But this is your time.

CLOSING ARGUMENT OF SETTLING DEVOTIONAL CLAIMANTS

MR. MacLEAN: Thank you, your Honor. And since you have already seen my three C's slide, I can just skip through it. Actually, I just wanted to reemphasize here that the three Cs of consistency, confidence and certainty, is what the SDC has consistently asked for in these proceedings. And because it relates directly to this question, I wanted to address Judge Strickler's question from the beginning of the proceeding here today relating to the Judges' obligation under the statute to act in accordance with prior determinations.

And although we have all used the phrase precedent a little bit loosely, I think Judge Strickler's question gets to the point that precedent usually applies to decisions of two circumstances is met. First of all there have been changed circumstances from prior proceedings, or second, evidence on the record that requires prior conclusions to be modified.

So your prior determinations are not written in stone, however, we also -- the statutory intent is that we not and you not have to reinvent the wheel every time we go through this.

So with that I will get into my principal presentation here. Slide, please.

So this is what I'm going to talk about today. First, I'm going to focus on the fee-based regressions and I will spend most of my time on this. I do have a lot of slides, but I'd much rather answer your questions than go through all of my slides. So if you have questions -- it is actually not a particularly complicated subject, but it is a subject on which most of us are not accustomed to thinking all the time. So I do want to address those.

I'm probably not going to spend any time on the viewing hours study, because frankly I don't have anything to add to what has already been said today. I probably won't

law, but entitled to stare decisis. But that is not what the statute says. The statute says that the Copyright Royalty Judges will act in accordance with prior determinations. And that is Section 803(a).

And what the legislative history specifically goes to show is that there was a frustration with earlier versions, with Judges' predecessors, frankly, in that different panels would come on, give inconsistent determinations. There would be -- you never really knew what the panels were going to do next. So this Tribunal here is one of the very few Tribunals, in fact, quite possibly the only Tribunal in the country whose statute, rather than merely common law, puts into the requirements that you act in accordance with prior determinations.

And you have precedent on this issue. Because in the 1988 to '99 Phase I decision, which is in the Federal Register 69 FR 3606, it was explained that the Judges -- or at that time it was still the CARP -- should follow prior determinations that would include the basis for prior determinations, unless one of

spend any time on that, unless of course you have questions.

Third, I will go to the survey methodologies. We believe that the surveys are the mostly reliable, robust, and reasonable approach in these proceedings. And we also believe that the Horowitz survey does provide some usefulness to the Bortz survey both in corroborating the Bortz survey and giving it some sense of the direction and magnitude of certain potential biases in one of those surveys.

And finally, time permitting, I may address the Public Television changed circumstances argument.

With regard to fee-based regressions, there are basically two points that I want to make. The first -- and this is the most important point -- correlation with fees paid is not value. That is a misinterpretation of the coefficients. And I will explain that later. But in short, interpreting these coefficients as measures of marginal value leads to an absurd results and is simply not the correct econometric reasoning to put into

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

8

9:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

4495

this.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

would explain that?

The second point is that due to the sensitivity and frankly the selection that has occurred in the course of developing these regressions, anything can be, quote, "corroborated" by these regressions. They are simply not reliable and robust.

Slide. Here is the key question that any of the proponents of the fee-based regressions need to be able to answer. And a few of them have some time remaining on rebuttal and they can try to answer, but I submit that they cannot. Why would a lower fee paying system or subscriber group choose to retransmit more minutes of programming that it does not value? Because ultimately at the end of the day, that's what a correlation means. All else being equal -- and what all else being equal means depends on the control variables -but every correlation means all else being equal, those lower fee paying systems are retransmitting more minutes of those programs that get lower value coefficients than higher fee paying systems are retransmitting. That's what it means in every single case. And so the

royalties are paid disproportionately by bigger 1 2 systems or bigger subscriber groups who are 3 : paying more royalties into the system with the coefficients that they say suggest a particular 5 allocation? 6

MR. MacLEAN: I understand that, your Honor. And it's all about what the coefficient means. Okay? Go to the next slide. I can demonstrate this graphically. You have seen this before. And what this shows on the Y axis column is the cost. But remember in this circumstance, cost isn't a market price. | Cost | is in every case simply calculated as a percentage of receipts. What percentage that is can go up or down based on the number of DSEs, and in some cases the type of DSE. But it is always, always a percentage of receipts.

This isn't a case -- importantly, this isn't the case where, for example, lower percentage fee receipt systems are retransmitting more minutes of, for example in this example, Devotional programming because it's cheaper. From the system's point of view there is no cost distinction between these categoriles of programming, except in very

4493

special cases like network or Public Television

Next slide. The answer to this question: It wouldn't. A lower-fee paying system or subscriber group would not retransmit, would not choose to retransmit more minutes of a category of programming if they didn't value it.

question is what is the economic reasoning that

JUDGE STRICKLER: You say if they don't value it. But could a system -- I'm going to use a word that maybe is not apt -isn't that a subjective value? That is to say the value to the subscribers -- that is why subjective is a bad word -- value to the subscribers to that group or to that system. So if I understand -- I read your papers as

well -- if I understand your point, you are saying that value doesn't equate to fee paying and therefore it doesn't equate to royalties.

But what we are trying to do here is allocate royalties. That being the case, why should we

22 be concerned with value to a particular 23

subscriber group or system? What we are trying to do is figure out

how to allocate the royalties and certain

1 2 programs. There is no difference in cost. 3 So if in this example lower-fee paying 4

systems are retransmitting more minutes of Devotional programs, it is not an indicator of negative value as each of the regressions would interpret a downward sloping coefficient. It's not that they are pulling down the value of the systems by including minutes that have negative value. It's because basically there is a niche | market. Not only among subscribers, but also potentially among systems and subscriber groups themselves. And there are communities, subscriber groups, systems out there that do value all of these kinds of programming. JUDGE STRICKLER: Aren't they

incorporated in all of the Waldfogel type regressions, those systems?

19 MR. MacLEAN: Well, first not 20 necessarily, and I'll get to that in a second. 21 But secondly that is not really the point I'm

22 making. The point I'm making has to do with 23 interpretation of the coefficients. If all 24

systems valued a category of programming equally, and more importantly retransmitted a

25

```
particular type of programming in more or less equal numbers of minutes -- let's say everybody thought, oh, sports is great. Let's retransmit all of the minutes of sports we can.

JUDGE STRICKLER: You would have no variation and no regression.

MR. MacLEAN: Exactly.

JUDGE STRICKLER: No meaningful regression.

MR. MacLEAN: Exactly. You would have
```

MR. MacLEAN: Exactly. You would have no variation and you would have a very low coefficient or an insignificant coefficient. But in fact, that would indicate everybody values it or potentially nobody values it.

So, yes, absolutely there is likely variation among systems as to how much they value different kinds of programming. And also there are variations among systems and subscriber groups about availability of kinds of programming, both availability in total and also availability as a distant signal, as opposed to as a local signal, which is another issue.

My point is simply that that variation doesn't tell you much about value as such.

say -- I'm not saying a negative coefficient is necessarily a negative value -- but he still uses it as negative value when he calculates his shares, but he adjusts it up to zero saying, well, there is notionally no way we can give a negative share.

Dr. George says, yeah, it's negative value. And she actually calculates negative shares in her regression. Dr. Crawford says he doesn't get negative coefficients. That is not accurate and I will get to that in a second. But Dr. Crawford says he doesn't get negative coefficients. But he is still interpreting the slope of the line as a measure of marginal value.

So in Dr. Crawford's view, a more or less flat line is going to be zero value, even though we just talked about a more or less flat line could mean that everybody values the program. And he thinks of a positive sloping line as a measure of positive value, even though as you see in this slide in front of you, a positive sloping line actually means — necessarily means that fewer of the lower receipt systems — that is to say the lower fee

What it tells you is that these minutes are being retransmitted either based on availability or based on preferences of the system, or for some other reason more by fee paying systems at the lower end.

If you interpret that coefficient as negative value then you wouldn't be saying these lower fee paying systems do value the programming. You would be saying, if you interpreted it as negative value, there is a negative value to that program. If you interpret that negative sloping line as a negative value, then that is just an incorrect interpretation.

It tells you something about the characteristics of the system that are retransmitting these minutes.

 $\hspace{1.5cm} \hbox{ If we could go to the next slide,} \\ \hbox{ please.} \\$

JUDGE STRICKLER: Does anybody who supports a Waldfogel regression approach say that the coefficient reflects negative value to that category of programming if it is a

negative coefficient?

MR. MacLEAN: Now, Dr. Israel will

paying systems, are apparently retransmitting fewer of those minutes. If those systems started retransmitting more minutes of a category of programming, that would actually bring the coefficient down, even though what it actually indicates is that those systems value that programming, presumably, since they are choosing to retransmit.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Let's go back to perhaps a basic principle. How do you define value in your analysis?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ MacLEAN: Reasonable fair market value. Fair market value --

JUDGE STRICKLER: I'm talking about it not in terms of the standard that we apply, but you're talking about value here in this chart. What is the value that you are referring to? You say this --

MR. MacLEAN: I'm saying that this chart doesn't show value. What Dr. Crawford says, and the other expert presenting regressions say, this slope, the slope of this line -
JUDGE STRICKLER: Which line? Either

25 line.

4500 4502 1 MR. MacLEAN: Either line. The slope JUDGE STRICKLER: Does Dr. Erdem have 2 of the line, whatever the linear regression this particular demonstrative in his own papers? 3 tells you the slope is, that that is the 3 4 measure of a marginal value per minute. And 4 MR. MacLEAN: Not this drawing. This 5 you could take that measure -- Dr. Crawford has is a drawing that I did with Dr. Crawford while 5 6 to do a little bit of adjustment because of the 6 : we were up. 7 law of transformation. But that point is 7 JUDGE STRICKLER: And he has nothing 8 basically, that coefficient, that slope 8 similar to this. Your argument is it is 9 translates to a measure of marginal value per 9: explained in words? 10 minute. Multiply that by a number of minutes, 10 MR. MacLEAN: Correct. 11 boom. You've got a value. 11 JUDGE STRICKLER: But the depiction 12 JUDGE STRICKLER: Where would we find 12 that we see here, that is not in his papers? 13 this analysis in your testimony? MR, MacLEAN: That's correct. This is 13: 14 MR. MacLEAN: That's explained in to try to make it more clear for you and 14 15 Dr. Crawford's written testimony and his oral 15 everybody here to understand what I am saying, testimony and Dr. Israel's written testimony 16 16: which is that the coefficient measures 17 and Dr. Israel's oral testimony. They all 17 correlation between, on the one hand, fees 18 explain how they do this exactly, and that's 18: paid, and on the other hand, number of minutes. 19 how they do it. 19 JUDGE STRICKLER: And that is 20 JUDGE STRICKLER: No, I'm not talking 20 consistent with Dr. Erdem's testimony? 21 about what they do. The criticism that you are 21: MR. MacLEAN: And Dr. Crawford's and 22 launching here in using this demonstrative, if 22 : Dr. [Israel's. : 23 you will, in whose testimony will we find it? 23 ' JUDGE STRICKLER: But Dr. Erdem was 24 MR. MacLEAN: Dr. Ervin's testimony. 24 your witness. He didn't want to make it clear? 25 JUDGE STRICKLER: And that's cited in 25 Why wasn't it in his papers? 4501 4503 1 your papers, both your proposed and response? 1 -MR. MacLEAN: I don't know how to 2 MR. MacLEAN: Yes, your Honor. It's 2 answer that, your Honor. I mean, Dr. Erdem 3 in Dr. Ervin's testimony. It's also in 3: explained it in words. I'm trying to help 4 Dr. Crawford's oral testimony when I explain it in pictures, and as I did with 4 : 5 cross-examined him. This is the slide, in 5 -Dr. Crawford. But it's one way or the other. 6 fact, from my cross-examination of 6 Dr. Crawford did explain exactly what I'm 7 Dr. Crawford. 7 explaining. If, for example, lower fee paying 8 JUDGE STRICKLER: I know it's your 8 systems were to drop CTV programming, were to retransmit -- I'm sorry -- were to add CTV slide. But I'm wondering if it's an expert's 9 9 10 slide, one that any expert has adopted. That 10 programming. So we really value the CTV 11 is my question. 11 programming. We are going to add on. We are 12 MR. MacLEAN: Well, I would argue that 12 going to retransmit more minutes. That is 13 Dr. Crawford has by answering my questions 13 | going to cause CTV's coefficient in this about it. This is what a coefficient means. A 14 14 example to go down, not up. 15 What it actually indicates on a review coefficient is correlation and everybody has 15: 16 agreed with that. 16 of preferences theory is that those systems are 17 JUDGE STRICKLER: Well, my -- my 17 actually valuing that more. That is all 18 question at this point is pretty much now an 18 completely explained in Dr. Erdem's oral evidentiary question. You find this particular 19 19 testimony. 20 20 JUDGE STRICKLER: Thank you. demonstrative to be explanatory? 21 21 MR. MacLEAN: If we could go to the MR. MacLEAN: Yes. 22 JUDGE STRICKLER: And you say it is 22 next slide, please. If you were to interpret these 23 backed up by, among others, your 1:47 23 24 24 negative coefficients, for example, as negative Dr. Erdem? 25 value, you get really absurd results. For 25 MR. MacLEAN: Yes.

network programming.

1

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

1

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

example, both Dr. Israel's regression and

coefficients. Dr. Israel's is expressed and

Dr. Crawford's is implied in the number of

minutes, they get negative coefficients for

programming is very valuable. But it makes

coefficients as being correlation between fees

paid and the number of minutes retransmitted.

Because network minutes are most likely to be

station. It makes complete sense, but only if

JUDGE STRICKLER: What is your

MR. MacLEAN: They are correlated with

you correctly understand these coefficients.

position as to what the coefficients mean if

characteristics of the system. What they tell

what it tells you is that on average, lower-fee

you is -- if there is a negative correlation,

they are not representing relative value?

retransmitted by those systems that are in

markets that don't have their own local

absolute sense when you understand these

market value, because we know network

That makes no sense as a matter of

Dr. Crawford's regression come up with negative distant signals and the number of nonduplicated

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

will cause system receipts to vary. JUDGE STRICKLER: Because one uses subscriber groups and one uses systems.

MR. MacLEAN: That's one difference. Another difference is Dr. Israel uses a level-level regression. This is very important

and one that I definitely wanted to explain. Dr. Crawford uses a log-level regression. That is to say his dependent variable is log

error -- and system receipts vary depending on

subscriber groups within the system; correct?

also have to remember that there are different

interpretations depending on whether you use

regression. That is one of the factors that

Dr. Crawford's regression or Dr. Israel's

MR. MacLEAN: That's true. But you

the size of the system or the size of the

18 transformed.

> JUDGE STRICKLER: Let's just stay with the system. I know you are going to get into that. System receipts vary by the size of the system. So larger systems are responsible for more of the total royalties that are paid into the pool. And isn't the point of a Waldfogel regression to say in the larger systems we can

1

see what their choices were, so the argument

goes, we can find the implicit choices that are being made because they decide to rebroadcast a distant signal -- a local signal distantly and

we can find such a percent of total programming that is Program Suppliers, a certain percent

that's Devotional, certain percent for Joint

Sports, et cetera.

Isn't that their argument as to why it is okay that there is a correlation with system receipts in the coefficient? Because that is just taking to the total royalty pool, which is what we are here to allocate. Do you agree with me that that is their argument?

MR. MacLEAN: I'm not sure if I want to characterize their argument. But I will say if that's their argument --

JUDGE STRICKLER: You can characterize their argument. Tell me.

MR. MacLEAN: No, I don't think that is their argument. Because if that were the case -- if that were the case, then the approach would be: Look at the available signals and look at the characteristics that make a signal more likely to be picked up by a

paying systems are retransmitting more of those minutes than higher-fee paying systems are. That is what a negative coefficient means. JUDGE STRICKLER: My question was more

broad. Excuse me. What do the coefficients mean if they don't depict relative market value, as the Waldfogel regression suggests, once you multiply it by the number of subscribers?

MR. MacLEAN: It means there are variations in system receipts that may be caused by any number of factors. We presented geography as an important factor, but not the only factor. But it means that system receipts are varying in a systematic way and that retransmission of minutes is also varying in a systematic way.

And that could be based on system preferences, different preferences, and for example, different geographies -- I am just presenting that as one possible reason -- or signal availability. That is a very important

JUDGE STRICKLER: And system receipts -- correct me if you think I'm in

4508 4510 system or less likely to be picked up by the negative coefficient as a negative value. And 1 1 2 every expert who has presented would interpret 2 3 3 : a negative coefficient as negative value, even The problem is none of the regressions 4 look at the content of signals that are not though Dr. Israel admits that a negative 4 5 retransmitted. So none of the regressions 5 coefficient doesn't mean it literally has 6 looked at: Is if more or less probable that a 6 negative value. 7 system at this fee level is going to retransmit 7 JUDGE STRICKLER: Didn't one of the experts -- I may get this wrong -- Dr. George 8 this station with this content or this station? 8 9 None of the regressions looked at that. 9 indicate that she thought that a negative 10 JUDGE STRICKLER: You made that point 10 coefficient might be indicative of an 11 during the presentation of your case. Are you 11 opportunity cost, that you are losing overall 12 saying that you have to do that to get relative 12 value by your particular selection of a program 13 value in the system receipts, or can you do it 13 type relative to another program type that could have enlarged your overall value? So 14 just doing it the way I understand Waldfogel 14 15 regressions do it, looking at the weighting of 15 it's not that it costs you money. 16 the different categories that are chosen is to 16 Certainly if you're broadcasting a 17 figure out relative value? local station distantly that is more heavily 17 18 I understand your point. Are you 18 weighted towards Devotional, for example, it! 19 19 saying that that's the only way to do it? You may increase value -- and probably does so the 20 would have to compare what was chosen with what argument would go -- in that particular area. 20 : 21 was not chosen? 21 But relative to what it might do overall, on 22 22 MR. MacLEAN: I'm saying that is the average it tends to lower the value. So the 23 only way to do it if the goal is to figure out 23 coefficient is an opportunity cost, if I'm 24 what makes a system at any given fee level more 24 remembering her testimony correctly. And even 25 or less likely to choose to retransmit a given 25 if I am, I may be mischaracterizing it. 4509 4511 1 station at that price. 1 But do you recall the opportunity cost 2 JUDGE STRICKLER: Is that also in 2 explanation of the negative coefficient? 3 Dr. Erdem's testimony? 3 MR. MacLEAN: I do not recall that 4 MR. MacLEAN: That was in 4 particular explanation. 5 Dr. Crawford's testimony. 5 JUDGE STRICKLER: Your recollection 6 JUDGE STRICKLER: Dr. Crawford adopted 6 may be better than mine. I will check the 7 what you just said, that the proper way to 7 record. MR. MacLEAN: I don't want to try to 8 figure out the value in a Waldfogel type 8 9 regression is to analyze the programs that were 9 recall Dr. George's testimony without recalling 10 not selected? I don't remember him saving 10 exactly what you're referring to. However, 11 that. Maybe I need to go back to the record. let's assume for a moment that she did say 11 something like that. That would still be 12 MR. MacLEAN: We presented some 12 13 testimony with Dr. Crawford relating to an 13 inconsistent with the conclusion of negative 14 article that he published previously in which 14 value, because even -- because there is still 15 he proposed something like what we just 15 positive value if you are retransmitting some 16 described as a valuation measure; looked at the 16 program in place of another program. 17 likelihood of a station being carried on a 17 But the other point I want to make is 18 remember this coefficient doesn't reflect a regional network. 18 19 Now, did Dr. Erdem in his testimony 19 choice to pay less or more for a particular 20 20 say this is the way you have to do it? station. It reflects a choice to buy a 21 Dr. Erdem didn't propose a way to do it. He 21 particular system or subscriber group versus 22 said you can't do it the way they do it because 22 another system or subscriber group with 23 that negative correlation doesn't mean negative 23 different characteristics. That's what the 24 24 value. That is really the fundamental point. coefficient reflects. It leads to absurd results if you interpret a 25 And that's really the basic point I'm

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4512

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25 is lower relative to sports, say, then you

trying to get at. That if you've got these lower-fee systems retransmitting these minutes 2 would have more money flowing in in terms of

of programming, that doesn't mean -- A, it 3 doesn't mean that the higher-fee systems don't 4

royalties, which are a function of receipts, as you acknowledge. You have more money flowing 4

5 value it. It just means that the higher-fee

5 into the pool of royalties coming from the

systems aren't retransmitting as many minutes. 6

areas where people have not only a higher 6 willingness to pay, but more importantly, an 7

It certainly doesn't mean that that is negative 7 8 value and it doesn't say anything about really opportunity costs either. Because those lower 9

8 ability to pay, which gets translated into

fee systems, for whatever reasons, are apparently choosing to retransmit more minutes.

9 higher fees and maybe also just more people, 10 because that amount is then multiplied by the number of subscribers; right? 11

If I could ask for slide 12, please. This is a map from Mr. Sanders' testimony in which he shows -- they say Gallop polls -relative religiosity across different geographies. And what you see is that there are variations across geographies about relative levels of religiosity. It is possible -- and I don't claim to be able to explain every single aspect of the correlation, but it is possible in these markets that are more green that these systems and subscriber

So you end up having a lot of people paying somewhat more, compared to people in the darker green that arguably -- not necessarily the case, because we are looking at correlation here, not causation -- arguably people who are paying less, because they would have paid a lot more if they could, but they didn't.

groups are valuing Devotional programming more. JUDGE STRICKLER: That sort of gets

Isn't that what the Waldfogel regression, in part, is showing us? So value comes out not of just a revealed preference but a revealed ability to pay.

back to my question. When you say they are

MR. MacLEAN: It is possible that you could get a correlation based on an ability to

24 pay. But it is also possible that that 25

valuing Devotional programming more, what does it mean in economic terms when you say they are valuing it? Are you saying they have a higher willingness to pay for Devotional programming than, say, sports? Is that your point? The willingness-to-pay concept?

variation could tell you something about value, 1 although you do have to make a couple of 2 3 inferential leaps.

MR. MacLEAN: Possibly higher willingness to pay than sports. But what is really important is higher willingness to pay than a system maybe in a different geography.

However, a lower payment does not mean a negative value. And that's the key point here. That -- this is exactly the point that Dr. Erdem made when he was testifying. If you simply multiply that coefficient by number of minutes, you are implicitly saying if I find a negative correlation -- that is to say if I find that low-receipt systems are retransmitting more of this kind of minutes of programming -- that is not lower value; that is negative value. That is what that interpretation would implicitly say.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Here is where we get to the issue of the fees themselves, because willingness to pay has nested within it, and not often discussed, ability to pay. So people may have a high willingness to pay for something, but lacking the ability to pay for it. Then that is subsumed in willingness. The total fees that will be paid in those systems will be lower because the people may have lower incomes, lower wealth, what have you. Whereas the areas that are lighter green, if it turns

out to be the case -- I think this would be one

stations -- of programs is such that Devotional

of the fixed effects in these regressions --

income was higher than if the complement of

So yes, you're right. And like I said, there is some information about the characteristics of the system. And there may be, if you make enough inferential leaps, some ways to get from those characteristics of the system to get to something that has something to do with value. But that is not the way that any of these regressions are interpreting their coefficient. And that's the point I want to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

4519

If I could go quickly to page 14, slide 14. I want to make the point that Dr. Crawford's regression -- actually, the point was made that it gives positive and statistically significant correlations for everybody. Not true.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Actually, let's go to 13, first. Once you apply the level shift that we discussed ad infinitum during his oral testimony, what you will find is that he would find a negative correlation with respect to Program Suppliers, Public Television and Devotional Claimants once you apply the statistically significant coefficient for nonduplicated minutes. This is precisely -- and next slide -- you could actually do the exact same math with the number of distant signals in his so-called initial analysis simply by dividing that coefficient by 262,800. The point is -- and you get essentially the same result.

If we go to the next slide, please. This is the very issue on which Dr. Crawford admitted that he is not sure that his shares are correct. And there at the bottom: "And you are not sure that you don't? And I am not

4516

correctly calculated precisely because he 2 · doesn't -- he did not consider the fact that

γ. when he controlled for the number of distant

signals in his so-called initial regression,

5: and the number of unduplicated minutes in his alternative regression, that that is measuring 6

the coefficient, the correlation, when you add

8 . a minute of programming while taking away a

9 : minute of another kind of programming -- in his

10 case network programming or unduplicated network programming, which as we said is 11

12 . actually quite valuable, but gets a negative

13 coefficient.

14

16:

17:

18

19

20 -

21

22 .

23 :

24:

25:

8

9 :

10

11

12

13

14:

15

16!

17

18

15

If you interpret these results -- a negative coefficient as negative value, this would imply that the entire royalty funds should go to sports, CTV, and Canadian, and that is an absurd result.

And finally, if I could ask quickly to look at slide 21. And this gets to the question that I was saying earlier. There is a difference in how Dr. Crawford controls for subscribers and how Dr. Israel controls for subscribers.

Dr. Crawford failed to account for the

fact that his dependent variable is log 2 transformed. And because that is going to

> 3 relate to subscribers, as you said, the fee is going to relate to subscribers, he should have

5 . log transformed his independent variable for 6

the number of subscribers if he is going to interpret it that way. 7 i

So therefore, if you were to reject everything I have said about the reason that these regressions are not usable, and if you were, therefore, to adopt Mr. Stewart's suggestion that you should split the difference between Bortz results and regression results here, this 6 percent is the lower number that you should use for CTV in making that regression. When you correctly control for the number of subscribers and otherwise adopt Dr. Crawford's interpretation of the regression results, CTV is highly sensitive to this number-of-subscribers control.

19 20:

21 They say all you are doing is 22 replicating the fee formula. That's the

23 purpose of a control. To remove the influence of a variable. To remove the influence of a 24

variable so you can isolate the influence of

4517

sure that I don't." That is, I don't agree with me that he should have taken into account that level shift.

PTV has said, no, Dr. Crawford did not admit that his shares were wrong in calculating. "I consider them both reasonable justifications. I don't think Dr. Israel was wrong in particular or that I was wrong in particular." That is from PTV Findings of Fact responses.

Next slide. Here is the full quote. "I think they are -- I consider them both reasonable justifications. I don't think he was wrong in particular or that I was wrong in particular."

"Question: Actually, you don't know if you are wrong; right?"

"Answer: Yes."

Now, I agree with Mr. Stewart when he says it would have been appropriate, for example, for Program Suppliers to withdraw its viewer hours study under the circumstances. And I would submit that Dr. Crawford's regression should be put in that same boat. He doesn't know if his shares are

25

4523

other variables. If you accept this

interpretation, then use the lower number for

1

2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4520

1 2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

sensitivity testing than Dr. Erdem? MR. MacLEAN: When I asked Dr. Crawford about what sensitivity testing he did, he referred back to the earlier

5 regressions.

> JUDGE STRICKLER: Are you talking about the ones that were not produced?

MR. MacLEAN: The ones that were not produced. The ones that he considered and rejected and then led ultimately to the evolution through a selection process to the final regressions that he presented. 12

JUDGE STRICKLER: So it's your understanding that in the record we have no record of his sensitivity analyses?

MR. MacLEAN: That is absolutely true.

In conclusion, your Honor, we propose using the Bortz results, modified as necessary based on the Horowitz results and the McLaughlin adjustments, as indicators of the direction and magnitude of potential biases.

The one hypothesis about a bias in favor of the Devotionals that has been proposed has not been established. Dr. Erdem proposed his quality of means test, which shows no

4521

statistically detectable systematic difference

1 across the years. It is nothing but a 2 3 hypothesis. 4 We are the Devotional Claimants. We 5 believe in the scientific method and we

has raised some alleged faults with this test. But here is my final question. I will leave it with that. Where is their test?

proposed a test. JSC has found some faults, or

We don't think the Judges should speculate. The Bortz results provide reasonable results. The Horowitz survey provides a reasonable basis in which to examine the possible direction and magnitudes of potential biases. And between those results, we believe there lies the best possible answer that the Judges have before them.

JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you,

Mr. MacLean.

MR. MacLEAN: Thank you.

21 JUDGE BARNETT: By my reckoning, we 22 have a little over an hour in rebuttal time.

> So in order to give the court reporters an opportunity to -- plus we have initial argument

from Program Suppliers.

3 I've also made the point -- and the 4 5 Judges are very familiar with it by now, I won't belabor it because I'm out of time --6 Dr. Crawford's regression is selected. What 7 this means is he tried other regressions. He 8 9 rejected them because of their results. Statisticians call it phantom degrees of 10 freedom. To put it in more layman's terms, 11 it's just a statistical way of saying if you 12 13 look for something, you are going to find it. There are millions or even billions, 14 depending on how you count them, of different 15 16 possible solutions. The answers, the results 17 you get are highly sensitive to what you select. And if you're selecting your results 18 19 -- your model based on results, you can 20 corroborate anything. I'm not saying he did it 21 in bad faith. You could do it in bad faith; 22 you could do it not in bad faith. 23 If you look at these results and say these results don't meet my expectations, let's 24 25 make this change. Ah, that's more like it.

Let's make this other change. Ah, that's what I was expecting to see. There must have been something wrong with my prior regression.

If I'm doing that -- change, change, change, change -- you get to the point where: Oh, this is what I was expecting to see. And then you stop, because it's always in the last place you look for it.

And Dr. Crawford, unlike the other witnesses here, did not then do some sensitivity tests. Unlike, for example, Dr. Israel whose sensitivity tests showed that in the presence of geographic controls, CTV and sports both become statistically insignificant, CTV becoming negatively statistically significant.

If you were to adopt Dr. Israel's regression as a corroborative tool, you should just go ahead and allocate the entire pool to Program Suppliers and PTV, because they are the only ones who get positive and statistically significant results under that regression.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Refresh my recollection. Are you saying that Dr. Crawford did no sensitivity testing or did different

Det	termination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket N	10. 14	-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018
	4524		4526
1	MR. GARRETT: They waived.	1	listening to all of the different views on
2	JUDGE BARNETT: They waived? Thank	2:	viewing, and I will try to in the course of
1	-	3	
3	you. That is very thoughtful.	1 -	my presentation, try to address as many these
4	At any rate, it is early. But we're	4	issues as I can.
5	going to go ahead and take our recess now so we	1	I think it's a line from Invictus that
6	can get the court reporters sorted. Then we	6	said something to the effect of my head is
7	will come back and hear from Program Suppliers	7	bloody but unbowed. And that's sort of how I
8	and take rebuttal. It is not necessary that	8:	feel when both Mr. Stewart and Mr. Garrett talk
9	you use all of your reserved rebuttal time, but	9:	about viewing and Dr. Gray's work, and
10	it is there.	10	hopefully I'll get to address some of those
11	MR. STEWART: Your Honor, in light of	11	also.
12	Mr. MacLean having gone over his argument time	12	I won't spend time talking about who
13	by eight minutes, we are going to ask for	13	we are and the Claimants that we represent. I
14	additional time to respond because he we would	14	think Ms. Jane Saunders' testimony covers all
15	like to have additional time to rebut or 15	15	of that, but it is worth noting that under our
16	minutes 16 actually.	16	umbrella of rightsholders, you will find not
17	JUDGE BARNETT: You have 16. See what	17	only, you know, Claimants like Viacom and
18	you can do with it. Mr. McLean's transgression	18	Disney and NBC Universal; you will also find
19	I think was Judge-created. But we will see how	19	our syndicated Claimants that represent the
20	it goes.	20	National Basketball Association, Major League
21	JUDGE STRICKLER: There is a lot of	21	Baseball, National Hockey League, and I believe
22	that going on.	22	the NFL also. Our claim also includes
23		23	
24	(A recess was taken at 1:38 p.m.,	1	Commercial Television station-produced programs
25	after which the trial resumed at 1:47 p.m.)	24	that are considered part of the they are in
1/7	JUDGE BARNETT: Please be seated.	25	the Program Suppliers' definition.
25		 	
25	4525		4527
1	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran.	1	
		1 2	4527
1	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your	-	4527 So we speak for hundreds of copyright
1 2	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the	2	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent.
1 2 3	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so,	2 3	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard
1 2 3 4	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker.	3 4	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative:
1 2 3 4 5	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you	3 4 5	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have
1 2 3 4 5 6	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal?	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes.	2 3 4 5 6	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative: marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative: marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble with that concept, but if that's your	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18: 19: 20:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different approaches to determine whether they constitute
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble with that concept, but if that's your agreement, that's fine.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18: 19: 20: 21:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different approaches to determine whether they constitute evidence of relative market value standard.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble with that concept, but if that's your agreement, that's fine. So go ahead, Mr. Olaniran.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18: 19: 20: 21: 22:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different approaches to determine whether they constitute evidence of relative market value standard.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble with that concept, but if that's your agreement, that's fine. So go ahead, Mr. Olaniran. CLOSING ARGUMENT BY COUNSEL FOR PROGRAM SUPPLIERS	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18: 19: 20: 21: 22: 23:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative: marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different approaches to determine whether they constitute evidence of relative market value standard. I urge you to consider whether each approach purporting to represent relative
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Good afternoon, Mr. Olaniran. MR. OLANIRAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is Greg Olaniran, for the record. It's very interesting coming in so, the last speaker. JUDGE BARNETT: I didn't ask. Are you hoping to reserve any time for rebuttal? MR. OLANIRAN: I believe ten minutes. JUDGE BARNETT: Okay. MR. OLANIRAN: If any. Being the last is also a disadvantage, to be the last. MR. LAANE: Your Honor, I'm not sure there's any real distinction because the way we set up the schedule is Program Suppliers is going last on their initial closing but first on their rebuttal. So it's all sort of the same thing. JUDGE BARNETT: If that's your agreement, I don't think that I have trouble with that concept, but if that's your agreement, that's fine. So go ahead, Mr. Olaniran.	2: 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: 12: 13: 14: 15: 16: 17: 18: 19: 20: 21: 22:	So we speak for hundreds of copyright holders and including some of our adversaries, to some extent. The parties agree that the standard for allocating royalties is the relative marketplace value. And Program Suppliers have always understood that their marketplace as a hypothetical one where the contemplated transactions, the buying and selling of distantly retransmitted non-network programs, occur absent the compulsory license, Section 111. The relative marketplace standard sounds simple enough, but as you can tell, with five different methodological approaches to their standard, it may not be so simple at all. And if you recall, in my opening statement in what seems like decades ago, I urged you to evaluate these different approaches to determine whether they constitute evidence of relative market value standard.

owners under Section 106, in order to broadcast a station on a distant basis, the CSO would

need to obtain the licenses from the many copyright owners of the programs aired on that

broadcast station.

Section 111 was enacted in significant part to avoid the transaction costs that would be associated with the licenses needed by the CSOs to publicly perform the works of copyright owners, of programs that are on the stations.

Section 111 is a limitation of Section 106 exclusive rights of the copyright owner in that the copyright owner of the program does not grant the CSO the license to publicly perform its work. Instead, it is the statutory license that accords the CSO the privilege of public performance of the copyright owner's programs embedded in the distantly retransmitted station.

The fees at issue here are compensation for exploitation of the copyright owners' work. Understanding that relationship between the Section 106 and 111 bears directly on the relative marketplace value standard.

In evaluating the different

applicable to the hypothetical market. In other words, I -- I urge you to ask the question how would evidence purporting to follow that standard stack up against evidence of how the market would operate absent the compulsory license?

And we believe, Program Suppliers believe, that the evidence that best answers that question is Program Suppliers' viewing methodology. We ask you to find that viewing methodology most directly and most persuasively encapsulates the relative marketplace value standard.

I plan to present our arguments in the following order, time permitting. Discuss the legal lens through which we believe that the Judges should evaluate the competing methodological approaches, discuss the record evidence with respect to the hypothetical marketplace, discuss our view and evidence presented in this case and why that evidence best fits the hypothetical market, discuss survey evidence and the -- and the argument against survey evidence as evidence of market value, and finally discuss fee-based regression

.

presented by Drs. Israel and Dr. Crawford and their inherent flaws that make them unreliable evidence of market value.

I -- I want to start with the discussion of the law, and I start with Section 106. Section 106 of the Copyright Act vests the copyright owner with certain exclusive rights. For copyright owners of motion pictures and other audiovisual works, the exclusive rights include the right to perform their protected works publicly. It's the right of public performance.

The language of Section 106 which references motion pictures and audiovisual works means that movies and other programs at issue in this case fall within those definitions and enjoy the protection of Section 106.

If CSOs' distant retransmission of a broadcast signal contains these protected works, it's considered public performance of the programs. Because of the rights granted -- I'm sorry, it's considered public performance of the programs. Because of the works -- because of the rights granted, the copyright

methodological approaches that are presented
here, we must keep in mind that the fees at
issue here are compensation for exploitation of
the copyright owners' works, work or works. In
this case, those works are the programs that
are carried in the signals, the programs embed
the in the signals carried by the CSO.

We should also keep in mind that the Section 106 -- that Sections 106 and 111 do not grant exclusive rights to program bundles, whether those bundles are in the form of program categories agreed upon by the parties here, whether those bundles are in the form of bundles used to present the results of certain methodologies presented in this proceeding, or whether those bundles are in the form of television channels as is the case, for example, with Canadian and Public Television.

It is the works that are embedded on those distant signals that are entitled to compensation through this allocation proceeding. And the fact that the works are presented in some organized form for the benefit of this administrative endeavor does not remove that fact or the applicability of

4535

4532

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the law.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JUDGE STRICKLER: You're saying it's okay to have these categories, which are sort of the antithesis of having each program being -- receiving value in and of itself as we do in a distribution proceeding?

MR. OLANIRAN: That's correct. But the parties are organized in a way that makes it convenient to make this cases, but that does not remove the fact that it's the work that's being compensated.

JUDGE STRICKLER: But we -- but here we compensate based on bundles of works, bundles, bundled into program categories. So you're saying bundling is good for the purposes of transacting business, if you will, under Section 111?

MR. OLANIRAN: Well, my point is that bundling is an administrative convenience. Each -- each bundle, I could come in ten years from now and reorganize in some other way as whatever the market allows me to do, in some other way, whatever -- however it's administratively convenient. Let's say two program categories merge five years from now.

articulated the critical elements of the market structure and how the various methodologies fit within those market structures.

We know how the current regulated market functions. I think it's on the slide. This is carriage by the CSO. There's no negotiating for the carriage parts. And the -the fees that are paid are paid by the CSOs to the Copyright Office.

And so in that previous slide, the CSO pays -- the copyright owner grants the right to broadcast or to air the program within a local market, and the broadcaster pays some licensing fee. They have some sort of arrangement in the market for the right to retransmit within the local market.

In the -- in the -- under Section 111, the CSO has the right to retransmit all of the programs bundled in the channel out of market, the CSO pays the Copyright Office, and the copyright owner -- this would be considered additional exploitation of the copyright owner's work, and we come here for a few months to try to figure out how the copyright owner: gets compensated for that additional

4533

whether they have 100 works. So the bundles themselves have no value, are not protected by the law. Their works are protected by the law.

compensate the individual copyright owner or

copyright owners, whether they have one work or

And you still have to figure out what to

So the point ultimately is that if you extend that logic, any methodology that claims to -- to claims that are presented relative to marketplace value here but does so only as to bundles of programming and provides no methods for valuing individual programs as falling short of the mark.

And then keeping that understanding in mind, I want to now turn to the hypothetical market itself. And in our view, this proceeding, we think, has provided what we think is by far the best articulation of the hypothetical market, as compared to, say, the last two Phase I proceedings.

While those proceedings adopted relative marketplace value standards and both purported to rely on the hypothetical market absent Section 111, neither actually

exploitation. And it's really critical that we keep in mind that it's the copyright owner that's being compensated, not groups of programming unless there's groups of protected programming owned by the copyright owner. But the fact that we are organized as Program Suppliers or Joint Sports Claimants is completely irrelevant to the compensation scheme. What's most important is compensating the copyright owner. So this is how the current market works. So what are the elements of the hypothetical market structure and how would the market function? According to the testimonies of Drs. Grav and Dr. Crawford and one of the few instances that they actually agree, the transactions to determine the relative market values of the programs would be free market transactions which will ensure the copyright.

markets. : In terms of the carriage of the -- in terms of carriage of distant signals, the current form, they both agree that the current

exploitation of their works by CSOs in distant

owners get a stream of income to cover the

Docket No. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018 Determination of Cable Royalty Funds 4536 form of carrying signals will continue as it 1 the television channel. 1 does exist in the current market. However, 2 JUDGE BARNETT: So in your 2 hypothetical market, the CSO still has to buy because Section 111 will not exist, rather than the complete signal of each broadcaster; they 4 statutorily prescribe royalty fees, there will 4 5 can't pick program by program? 5 be a market price for distantly retransmitted programs, which means that there will be no 6 MR. OLANIRAN: That's -- that's 6 7 correct. And I think that's sort of the 7 governmental involvement in a negotiation between the buyers and the sellers of 8 predominant thinking on the economists that actually commented on it. 9 programming. The players in the transactions, 9 10 And one way to think about it is how a 10 rather than the Judges, will make their own CSO -- what would a CSO do with an individual 11 11 financial arrangements. Also, the buyers would program unless maybe the CSO is building a 12 have no compulsion to buy and the sellers would 12 13 have no compulsion to sell. But both would 13 station or network of some sort, in which case they can go direct to the copyright owner. But 14 14 have reasonable knowledge of relevant facts. 15 Now, Drs. Gray, Dr. Crawford, 15 for broadcast stations, but for retransmission 16 of broadcast stations, which is sort of the 16 Dr. Erdem also agree as to how the market will realm that we're in, unless the CSO is actually function. The hypothetical market, they agree, 17 17 building or creating its own broadcast station, 18 would consist of two markets, a primary market 18 and a secondary market. In the primary market, 19 there will be no need, I think -- there will be 19 no need for the CSO to buy direct from the 20 the broadcaster would negotiate with the 20 21 copyright owner for dual rights. The first 21 copyright owner. 22 right would be the right that it has under 22 And I think the same efficiencies that 23 23 created Section 111 to some extent probably Section 111 to carry -- to air -- for the 24 broadcaster, to air the programming locally. 24 would still -- would -- would sort of dominate

25 whether or not a CSO would go buy programs 4539

4537

directly. 1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that the copyright owner would grant the broadcaster -- the copyright owner would grant the broadcaster the right to grant retransmission rights. I hope that's not too confusing. So the broadcaster acquires dual

The second right would be the right

rights from the copyright owner in that primary market. In the secondary market, the CSO would negotiate with the broadcaster to acquire the right to distant retransmission of the broadcaster's signal, which --

JUDGE STRICKLER: Can we see the slide just before that for a second?

> MR. OLANIRAN: Sure. Is that the one? JUDGE STRICKLER: That's the one.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

Okay. Thank you. MR. OLANIRAN: So in the secondary market, which I think is the slide we're now looking at, the CSO would negotiate with the broadcaster to acquire the right to distant retransmission of the broadcaster's signal. And if you recall, at this point, the broadcaster now has the rights from the primary market granted by the actual the copyright owner or owners that make up the bundle that is

And so the -- so with the negotiation between the CSO and the broadcast -- and the broadcaster, it would occur in the secondary market. And so the market value of the right that's granted the broadcaster in the primary market will be determined in that primary market because that needs to be determined in order for the broadcaster to have the right to grant retransmission rights to a CSO or CSOs that wish to retransmit the entire signal.

And that -- that transaction would be in the form of -- according to Dr. Gray, would be in the form of a surcharge or premium, some sort of two-tier compensation scheme.

In the secondary market negotiations, the broadcaster would seek to recoup the surcharge or the premium it paid to the individual copyright owners in the primary market through the transaction with the CSO.

Now, this -- this articulation of the free market is not entirely novel. As a matter of fact, this is what was characterized by the Register in a Section 302 report to Congress as sub-licensing. And I think we cite to that in

8 :

9 .

10

11 :

12:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19:

20

21 :

22 :

23 :

24:

25 :

12 .

13:

14

15:

16

17 :

18

19

20 :

21 :

22

23 :

24

25

our proposed findings. So it's not entirely novel, but it makes sense.

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So given that the value to be determined in the primary market for exploitation of the copyright owner's work, given that that value has to occur, so the question then is what is the most appropriate approach for determining the value in that market when the copyright owner, on whose behalf this scheme that we're in really is set up -- and to some extent the CSOs also, but in terms of the allocation of royalties, it really is in the copyright owner's interest -- so the question is what's the most appropriate methodology that speaks to that -- that -- the copyright owner's interest?

And it is our view that it is viewing. And why is it viewing? Many witnesses have spoken to why viewing matters, in general and in this particular context.

The most fundamental reason -- and I think it was Mr. Dove that spoke earlier. The most fundamental reason to accept viewing or to consider viewing is the fact that copyright owners or content creators create content for

just buying and selling ratings. His job, as

he described, is to meet with clients,

determine what their needs are, and figure out

the best way to cull from existing database or 5 . databases the information that the client is

seeking. And he understands all the various 6:

7 : databases. So in our case, he performs custom analysis.

According to Ms. Hamilton, a witness with several years as a CSO, she testified that viewing mattered in selecting distant signal carried and that she thought that viewing mattered in selecting distant signal carriers that she thought would best contribute to the subscriber attraction and retention.

CTV witness, Ms. Burdock, testified that viewing -- that viewing matters to determining what a station would pay to acquire the rights to air a program. That really goes to the primary market transaction.

It has been mentioned that viewing only matters when there's advertising, so that in the hypothetical market, there would be no advertising, so viewing would not be necessary, but the no advertising -- the -- the -- the

television to be consumed by an audience. If there is no audience, there's no vision part of the television. For that is the purpose.

So to construct a relative marketplace value of programs without regard to whether people are watching those programs or not is meaningless.

Mr. Lindstrom, who is an expert in market research and with particular expertise in custom audience research analysis and who worked at Nielsen for almost 40 years, testified that viewing is the currency of the marketplace. He testified that a broadcasters, CSOs, MSOs, cable networks, other media entities, rely on viewing for several different reasons, not necessarily that have anything -not necessarily because of advertising.

And I wanted to speak really quickly -- I know there has been this sort of idea that the viewing that Program Suppliers have presented in this proceeding is not actually viewing as known in the industry, and if anyone that has taken that position probably doesn't understand what Mr. Lindstrom does. Mr. Lindstrom is not in the shelf of

notion that advertising would be somehow: 1. 2 prohibited absent Section 111 really

misunderstands what a hypothetical market would 3 : 4: look like.

5 : Advertising is not allowed in the regulatory context because of the law itself. 6: 7 If the law goes away, then there's no prohibition on advertising and creative 8

9: businesspeople will figure out a way to +- to use it for that purpose, to use whatever the 10 market allows for that purpose. 11:

> JUDGE STRICKLER: Wasn't there also testimony, though, that even if the hypothetical market did allow for advertising, local advertising replacement, that the sliver of viewing of distantly retransmitted stations is so low that advertising revenue would be sort of a de minimis proposition?

> MR. OLANIRAN: That's true. There was testimony to that effect. But that also -while it may be true, there was no quantitative -- there was no information to quantify what that would look like. But I would also -- I submit to you that the -- the significance of viewing goes well beyond advertising.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6 7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

If you look at Mr. Pasquale's

advertising, specifically to predict whether or

And -- and that's very important. So

testimony, he was the one that talked about

premium cable channels like HBO who studied

here's a premium channel with no -- with no

commercial advertising within programs that's

still buying viewing information because that

viewing information, they can study because it

goes to whether or not their subscribers are

going to stay because there's a correlation

between declining viewing and subscribership.

also talked about how, in his consulting work,

he relied on viewing data to determine the

value of programming. Mr. Sanders, an SDC

would select to fill in the slots for each

admitted to using viewing not only in the

-- a distribution proceeding, if you will.

distribution proceeding, which is I think the

selected category of programming.

witness, said that viewing metrics would be a component to determining what programs a CSO

Dr. Erdem, another SDC witness,

On cross-examination, Mr. Trautman

not they're going to lose subscribers.

4544

1

3

4

5

6

7

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

distant subscribers for that station, the time of day the program aired by quarter-hour, and the type of program aired. Those are four different variables that he used.

The results of his analysis are presented in Table 2 of his testimony. For the regression analysis, Dr. Gray relied on four major data sources: the Nielsen viewing data, CDC's carriage data, the Gracenote programming data, and the CRTC logs. Now, there are two, maybe three major criticisms that have been made in this proceeding of the Nielsen data relied on by Dr. Gray. The first was that he should not have used the NPM data because the NPM database was designed for national, not local, viewing.

But none of the critics have Mr. Lindstrom's -- the benefit of Mr. Lindstrom's 40 years of experience working with clients on custom analysis.

Ms. Shagrin, who testified against the use of NPM, left Nielsen almost 20 years ago. Moreover, it was Mr. Nielsen who met with MPAA, understood what MPAA wished to do, wished to construct with regard to viewing, and

So there's no question that viewing is important and critical, at least in our view,

to value of a program. So now let's talk about Program Suppliers' methodology. Dr. Gray presented a regression analysis, which predicted the value of each quarter-hour of programming on each station in a random sample of stations he selected for each year, with the exception of WGNA.

It's really misleading to characterize Dr. Gray's work as just viewing, as if he just took a bunch of minutes, added them up, organized them into various program categories, and got these results. It really is misleading.

The fact that it's a multiple regression analysis which employs multiple variables, which in his view would have been an indication of -- an indicia of market value in a hypothetical market. For each year from 2010 to 2013, Dr. Gray's regression calculated a mathematical relationship between distant viewing for a program and the measure of local viewing for the program, the total number of

recommended the database.

JUDGE FEDER: I think you meant Mr. Lindstrom, not Mr. Nielsen.

MR. OLANIRAN: He might have met with Mr. Nielsen.

JUDGE STRICKLER: I think when he rips off the mask.

(Laughter.)

MR. OLANIRAN: Mr. Lindstrom also testified that the NPM is appropriate, even if you view the NPM as a national database. And it is appropriate because it is by far the best methodology, the best technology, the best method, the most consistent data collection process for measuring TV usage.

And he also did testify that there is some overlap between -- there are LPMs, local people meters, that actually contribute to the data that's published for NPMs. He also said that the NPM database is based upon viewing that's built up from very localized levels, but it's -- and he was emphatic that it's the aggregation that's most important. And his view was that if you believe

-- if you believe in sampling, you also have to

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

4547

1 2

believe in the NPM database that the NPM

23 :

quantified.

database is a good measure of viewing. That was Mr. Lindstrom's testimony.

Because Ms. Shagrin left Nielsen almost 20 years ago, I think it's reasonable to infer that she may not necessarily have been familiar with some of the technological advancements or methodological changes that happened that improved the NPM data and improved the application of the NPM data.

I also want to note that although Mr. Nielsen -- Mr. Lindstrom is no longer at Nielsen, but he did say that he was -- he did mention that he was appearing on behalf of Nielsen and that he was appearing with the full support of Nielsen, even though he no longer works there.

So the second criticism is the data itself, is about the data that Dr. Gray used itself. And the criticism that there were a lot of zero cells. And some of the witnesses didn't quite grasp what zero cells meant. And there was this sort of hullabaloo about the fact that there were a lot of zeros.

But distant signal viewing, in

unreliable. The data that represents the input
into the regression model is data that concerns
all of the stations in Dr. Gray — that are —
it's data that is supported by all of the
stations — I'm sorry, let me rephrase that.

The data used — the viewing used in Dr. Gray's
model is the data for all of the non-WGNA
stations in each of Dr. Gray's sample.

So to the extent that we're talking about that data, that data is reliable.

Now, I know that Mr. Garrett referred to some comparisons, excuse me, with regard to Program Suppliers' compensable programming on WGNA and so on and so forth. However, that isolates the activity on WGNA with regard to comparisons between Program Suppliers and JSC and perhaps some of the other Claimants.

What it doesn't do is put that comparison in the context of total distant viewing or total distant -- or of viewing of -- total distant viewing of compensable programs.

There's a reason for that, that -- why that effect of the absence of WGNA is not

As Mr. Lindstrom said in his

. . . . 4

general, I mean, both Dr. Gray and Mr. Lindstrom testify to this, is not a lot of viewing. And so the data, you would expect, would be sparse. And, in fact, Mr. Lindstrom said that, you know, this is not unusual at all, that you would have, you know, a small audience of distant viewing. It's to be expected.

And it's the sparse nature of distant viewing data that necessitated the regression analysis in the first place. If we had all the data, then we wouldn't need to make predictions about who would view and who wouldn't view. That's the purpose of the regression analysis.

And what -- and what ended up happening is that with the regression analysis, you actually wind up with a more robust analysis of viewing than perhaps you would have without one or by simply using the limited number of data that was available from this.

So the -- the biggest, perhaps, criticism specific to this proceeding is the absence of WGNA distant viewing data. And our response to that is that -- and the argument goes that the data is wrong and therefore

testimony, he said that programs on WGNA during 2010 through 2013, the programs were very small. Dr. Gray, I think, said there was dramatic decline in compensable programming on WGNA over time, such that it has become increasingly less and less important.

And let's be clear, the frequent carriage of WGNA -- I think it was Mr. Trautman when I cross-examined him about that, about whether or not there's some legacy carriage associated with different events of the carriage of WGNA, he said there could be.

And, again -- and the fees, the royalty fees associated with WGNA, we believe is the relic of the compulsory licensing scheme because given the size of -- the size of compensable programming on WGNA as observed by Mr. Lindstrom and Dr. Gray over a period of time, it would be unreasonable to expect that there would be a material impact of some sort because WGNA is somehow not part of the total pool of stations in the sample -- WGNA viewing is not part of that.

I also should mention that reliance on Dr. Gray's work, however you choose to rely on

evidence.

allocation.

it, given I think he said -- he said that the

zone of reasonableness, we do reference this in

decision-makers to rely on and accord weight to

determinations, especially when Nielsen numbers

are used as reference points for determining

allocation of awards in connection with other

Broadcasters, 146 F.3d 907, and the pinpoint

cite is 931 through -- 931 to 932. And that

that uncorrected -- that the CARP could not

find your way to that report, you'll see

familiar names, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Garrett,

Mr. Satterfield, and Mr. Cosentino.

rely on uncorrected Nielsen data. And if you

So this argument is not entirely meaningless. This will not be the first time

that the decision-makers would actually look at

was the appeal of the 1990-'92 Phase I

You will find that reference in -- I

And that was the case where NAB argued

results that he presents are within his own

our brief, that it's not arbitrary for

uncorrected Nielsen data in their

think it's National Association of

I am pressed on time, so I'm going to do it really quickly. I want to talk very

3 quickly -- I won't spend a lot of time on
4 Mr. Horowitz's testimony, only because to some

5 extent, the criticism -- I want to spend time 6 talking about Bortz a little bit, but from our 7 view, the -- the high mark with regard to

8 Mr. Horowitz's testimony and his methodologies

9 is that we think it is better done than Bortz

survey. We think that creating the other sports category, enhancing the program

definition with examples, customizing the

questionnaire to focus only on signals carried by respondents' system, reminding the

respondents not to assign any value to substituted programming, and having the

substituted programming, and having the ability to compare the Horowitz and Bortz.

Now, having the ability to make comparison between the Horowitz and Bortz surveys also allowed us to understand even better the challenges in general with surveys

and specifically with the Bortz survey.

It also allowed us to determine the extent to which live team sports programming

was overvalued under the Bortz survey, and to

Nielsen data that parties argued is incorrect and unreliable.

But -- so at the -- even with all of this criticism about the data, about whether or not the data is complete or not, we still argue -- we contend that Dr. Gray's analysis is very robust. He sampled approximately 150 stations per year. He used 17.4 million observations of quarter-hours of compensable programming for that four-year period. And that's about 4 million observations of the premium periods per royalty year.

So when you combine the non-recorded, the so-called zero cells, with the recorded viewing together, you had data from Nielsen for approximately, accepting, which I think most econometricians do, accepting that the zero cell actually constitutes data, non-recorded viewing constitutes data, so you have data for about 70 to 80 percent of the quarter-hours Dr. Gray was analyzing and for each year predicted distant viewing by cable subscriber households of TV stations for each quarter-hour of the day for seven days of the week and 365 days per year for each year from 2010 to 2013.

the extent that it absorbs a portion of the other sports, which is otherwise in there for the benefit of Program Suppliers. Also to the extent Bortz results undervalue the Program Suppliers category because of its failure to not -- to exclude other sports.

Now, just I want to speed this up a little bit and talk about some of our problems. I think we completely, completely and wholeheartedly, support some of the criticisms that were raised by Public Television Claimants insofar -- not for PTV specific ones but the ones that are in general are the problems with Bortz, but I want to mention a couple others before my time is up.

Our view is that Bortz does not represent evidence of marketplace value for a host of different reasons. We have agreement with two witnesses that told us what the market — what the market would look like, although they disagree on how they would construct the value. But we do have some sense, a better sense than I think was discussed in the determinations in '8 and '99 and 2004, of what the market would look like.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4556

4558

4559

```
It is clear, though, that as far as
this record is concerned, the Joint Sports
Claimants, all Bortz, have not articulated
precisely how the Bortz survey would work in a
hypothetical market.
```

And to start with, Joint Sports Claimants have -- there are several problems with Bortz, and I think I list some of them, some of them on the slide; the failure to articulate a market, the lack of validity, as expressed by Dr. Steckel, lack of reliability, by Dr. Stec, the recall bias which came out in my cross-examination of both Dr. Mathiowetz and Dr. -- and Mr. Trautman, the lack of consistency with regard to the language of the questionnaire, measuring only willingness to pay and ignoring the supply side, which with --Your Honor actually elicited that a few times in the questioning of Mr. Trautman, the fact that it measures an opinion and is not actual opinion. And it fails to specifically reference respondents' knowledge of distant signal programming.

All of these are very troublesome with regard to -- with regard to the Bortz survey.

the same conditions that Section 111 imposed on

2 | the CSOs that availed themselves of the

licensel 3 |

4 ' And then it says the CSO made royalty 5 payments for licenses subject to those conditions, and it is those payments that are 6

7 being allocated in this proceeding. And then

8 concludes that if the relative value of a

9. program category was X percent, with such

10: conditions in place, and Y under a different set of conditions, the relative market value, 11

12: and this percent said should be said X percent.

13 | This position is confounding, at best.

What it does is it says it ignores the 14: 15 long-established relative market value standard 16 for allocating royalties, because clearly this

17 is not advocating relative marketplace value.

18: It presumes, wrongly so, that the 19: relative market value of a program category can

20 be determined under Section 111 regulatory 21 | structure. And even worse still, it presumes

22 that whatever some purported value of a program

23 category is determined under the license should

24: be favored over something that's determined

25 under the relative market value standard.

I So this is just flatly wrong. And 1 | then there's Mr. Trautman's testimony that also 2 demonstrated that Bortz is not evidence of 3. marketplace value. Mr. Trautman considered 5 : that the Bortz survey is a demand-side survey and a willingness to pay survey. 6 : 7 The demand perspective only survey

does not constitute a marketplace survey 8 9. without any evidence of the supply side. 10 + Mr. Trautman, who has testified in numerous proceedings, testified that he did not even 11 | 12 ' have a concept of who the seller would be in a 13 hypothetical marketplace. On my 14 |

cross-examination, he was even confused about 15 the programming market experience respondents

should be drawing on in making relative market 16

17 value allocations.

18: This slide is my exchange with 19 Mr. Trautman when he was on the stand. I asked

20 : him: How are you ensuring that the person,

21 | meaning the respondent, has not been influenced 22 by the other types of programming that they are

23 carrying that are not on broadcast signals?

24 -His first response was: I think they should be 25 influenced by that. I think that their overall

And -- however, one of the more critical flaws in the Bortz is that it does not articulate the marketplace. Bortz still lives in this history of just going out, interviewing respondents, telling them what the program categories are, and asking them to figure out a way to make allocations.

Well, how does that work in the marketplace? It turns out that although the '98-'99 and '04-'05 decisions presume that Bortz is evidence of marketplace value, on cross-examination with Mr. Trautman and Dr. Mathiowetz, it turns out Bortz representatives don't even understand the market that the respondents are supposed to contemplate when they're responding to the questions.

Now I'll give you an example. If we go to slide 13, please.

So this is paragraph 3 of the proposed findings that Joint Sports Claimants submitted. And this is the language they have. It says the hypothetical market should be the same marketplace that existed under Section 111, where retransmission licenses are subject to

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-- I think that their overall as a cable

all of that should factor into their

operator, their overall packing decisions and

decisions with respect to cable networks and

consideration of the relative value of the

again. I inquired further: So then the

types of programming on these distant signals.

relative value allocations that you're looking

at for them should be influenced by programming

that are not on broadcast signals; is that what

should be influenced in response to my first

be informed by their knowledge about the value

to draw from that experience but you don't want

them to be influenced by that experience? Is

that a fair summary of your testimony?

of programming in the marketplace broadly.

So to get some clarity, I asked him

And if you recall, he had said they

And his response was: No, it should

And then I asked again: You want them

And he says: No, not a fair summary.

And the exchange goes on. Clearly,

4560

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

respondents had in mind a marketplace where the

Section 111 was still in effect. As to 2

Ouestion 3, the section -- the respondents had

in mind the Section 111 is not in effect. As to Question 4, she thought the respondents

would have in mind that Section 111 was still 6

7 in effect. So there are two different 8 conclusions from three different questions in

9 the Bortz survey.

> So the credit that the prior decision-makers had been giving Bortz with respect to the market that presumed the Bortz represented was not deserved at all.

With regard to construct validity, I know that Dr. -- Dr. Steckel gave an extensive explanation of why it was very difficult for respondents to answer the questions that they have been asked to do. If you go to the second one, the second slide. Thank you.

And why Bortz survey lacks construct validity. And the problem is what the respondents have been asked to do, one, it's complex. Two, it's not what they do every day. And what you're looking at in this slide is a CSO that has four different -- four different

We want them to be influenced by that

experience.

vou're saving?

question.

4561

even Mr. Trautman was not really clear, not just about what market but the understanding of what the respondents are responding to, what market they should be thinking about, whether it's just a distant signal market or the broad programming experience at large, which would be troublesome because making comparisons between -- making allocations with respect to value of programming on distant broadcast stations using broad programming experience for, say, ESPN or TBS or some of the cable -- some of the other cable networks is very misleading because it's very different business models.

And then there was Dr. Mathiowetz. I asked her the same questions. Dr. Mathiowetz was also inconsistent with regard to what marketplace the respondents had in time -- had in their mind in responding to the Bortz survey questions. And I think for Question 2b, the ranking question, she said that the -- she said that the respondents had a marketplace -- this is -- Dr. Mathiowetz is the one that stamps Bortz survey responses valid and reliable. She said, that's the Question 2b, the

signals, carrying four different signals, assuming that the CSO -- each signal has about ten, which actually on a regular station you have several more programming. And the CSO has been asked to -- to take the programming -- I mean, the CSO has been asked to take the

programming on each of the signals and then map it into some other type of program category

that we're using in this proceeding.

And the -- and they do it on average in about ten -- I think it was ten minutes, Mr. Trautman testified. It's a very complex exercise to do on the phone within such a short period of time. And I think Dr. Steckel was very articulate on this problem.

And then there was also Dr. Stec. Dr. Stec performed two exercises. The first one was looking at the response of CSOs across the board, Bortz respondents across four years, and he determined that it was inconsistent.

And then he determined that those responses were inconsistent and ran three different statistics; the correlation coefficient, the R squared, and the offer, which -- which supported his conclusion that

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

4563

4564 4566 the Bortz respondents' -- responses were whether it's subscribership or viewership or 1 something else, they're not just picking them 2 inconsistent across the four years. 3 He also then took the CSOs that both 3: out of a hat? 4 Horowitz and Bortz had in common and ran the MR. OLANIRAN: Well, but they -- since 5 same tests and determined that comparing the 5 they have to pay the minimum fee anyway, it's 6 results for those -- of those CSOs, that the 6 : very difficult to discern anything from that 7 results -- the results were, again, conduct. 8 inconsistent. JUDGE STRICKLER: Well, it's like --8 Quickly, with regard to the recall 9 9 1 it turns it like into a public good. I can go 10 bias, the 2010 survey, the Bortz survey was not 10 to the park and I don't have to pay for the completed until 2013. It took about -- it's a 11 11 park but I could pick among the parks I want to 12 14-month lag to when the year ended and when 12: go to. They are all free, but I would rank one 13 the respondents were being asked to respond to 13: over the other. If I'm New York City, I can go 14 questions. to Central Park and it's not going to cost me 14 anything; I could choose to go to Prospedt 15 The 2011, a portion of it, about 15 16 25 percent, was done in 20 -- I'm sorry, the 16 Park. I can go any place I want even though 17 2010 was not completed until 2012, and then the 17 it's free, but I'm ranking them based on my 18 2011 was not completed until 2013. 18 preferences. Why aren't the CSOs doing that in 19 So those are the highlights of it. 19 the same way in selecting stations because the 20 With regard to -- I wanted to talk to you mere fact that they're not paying for them 20 21 really quickly about this argument about 21 | doesn't mean that they don't have a rank value? 22 22 Dr. Gray's reformulation of Dr. Crawford's MR. OLANIRAN: But the distinguishing 23 results. And what Dr. Gray did was, to the 23 factor, though, among the minimum fee CSOs and 24 extent there's an argument that exists that 24: the CSOs that are paying more than the minimum 25 CSOs make economic choices under the -- under 25 fee is the fact that they are paying more than 4567 1 the Section 111 license, you have to accept the 1. they have to pay. 2 -- even if you don't agree with how Dr. Gray 2 . JUDGE STRICKLER: Well, you may get 3 did it, the point is still critical. 3: more information because they have to pay, but 4 And the point is that you can't -- the you're not getting no information when they 5 statutory minimum fees are going to be paid by 5: were going to pay the minimum fee anyway, 6 CSOs anyway. To the extent -- even though because they still have to make a decision as 6 7 Dr. Gray agrees with the regression analysis 7: to which stations they want to transmit. So 8 because it's based on -- it's based on there may still be information in terms of 8 9 regulatorily prescribed fees, if you are 9: ranking like you would for any -- if you're 10 looking to determine whether or not you can 10 | going to use any particular good, even if 11 glean anything from the conduct of a CSO, then 11 you're not paying for it, if it excludes 12 12: you look at the CSOs that actually paid what another good, you have to rank one versus the 13 they didn't have to pay, paid beyond the 13 other and you're getting a sense of relative 14 minimum fee, and look at the mix of programming 14 value, aren't you? 15 MR. OLANIRAN: I think you're correct that those CSOs carry. 15 16 That, to the extent that you agree 16 on that point. However, again, we -- to the 17 that there's an argument, then it makes -- then 17: extent you can glean anything from fees-based 18 that's how it makes sense. 18 regression, if there's an argument that while JUDGE STRICKLER: So don't you think, 19 19 -- you know, they're making economic choices, 20 20 | though, that the decisions that are made even if everyone paid minimum fee, they are equally 21 21 situated. However if you study, it's striking by those CSOs that have to pay the minimum fee 22 may still have to -- if we assume they're being 22 : that the CSOs that pay more than the minimum are the ones -- and if you look at the 23 at all rational, that they're ranking the 23: 24 program types or the stations themselves based programming mix that they carry, it is a 24 | upon whether or not they'll maximize some goal, striking difference from -- and I get your

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

point. JUDGE STRICKLER: And I understand your point too. But here's a problem that has been bothering me about that. Maybe you can help me out.

If you only have one DSE, so you have a minimum fee, and you want to get the station with the best mix that you think is optimal for you, even though, you know, you were going to pay anyway, so you're still rational, so say you think, well, something heavily weighted to sports, for example, would be the best station --

MR. OLANIRAN: Or movies, by the way. (Laughter.)

JUDGE STRICKLER: Well, if we quibble, I'll get confused. So let's stick with sports. So it's sports, and then say a station then has a second DSE and actually now has to pay extra and makes a choice. So now we'll take movies, okav?

So they say, well, now, you have -and I am following Dr. Gray's analysis where he carves out the minimum fees, now you see top-loaded with regard to movies and Program

you're paying a mandatory minimum fee, you're still going to rank -- if you assume rationality, you're still going to rank the stations based on those that provide you with the best, the optimum program mix for purposes of meeting some economic goal, retaining subscribers, viewership, whatever the goal happens to be. So if you ignore those and then go to the -- to those that are only paying more than the minimum fee, you're leaving out a lot of information that -- in terms of ranking value, aren't you?

MR. OLANIRAN: I think that's a fair point. But it is striking the difference between when you -- when you correct, when you correct Dr. Crawford's and only look at systems that actually -- that made choices to pay more than what's -- what they're required to pay.

And I accept as a fair point the fact that you may lose -- you may lose the ranking order, the order of importance, the order of value by the higher -- the rationale that constitutes a basis for -- for carriage.

JUDGE STRICKLER: And your point may be, and correct me if I'm mischaracterizing it,

4569

4568

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Suppliers' category and other categories as well, but they have -- but if you've already carved out those stations that -- where it

fee, those were the most valuable ones because some rational process was assumed, maybe it wasn't rational at all, maybe -- well, it may be rational, but it may be legacy carriage, but

But the question is if we only look at the second DSE, we're eliminating all the valuable information about ranking value even when you -- it's like a public good; you're going to have to pay for it anyway.

there's a whole bunch of issues that come in.

would have been accounted for in the minimum

So doesn't that make Dr. Gray's minimum fee carveout -- doesn't that obscure what the marketplace really looks like?

MR. OLANIRAN: Well, to the extent you deem it a marketplace. I think it's -- I think it's --

JUDGE STRICKLER: Well, relative

22 value. 23

MR. OLANIRAN: Right. JUDGE STRICKLER: It obscures relative

value because even when you're not -- even when

that you get better information if you're looking beyond the first DSE and the minimum fee because you have to pay in order to transmit additional stations, so that's better

5 information because you have to pay for the 6 privilege of doing so; whereas merely ranking 7 them when you were going to pay otherwise,

maybe you are getting weaker information with regard to preference?

MR. OLANIRAN: That's correct. And it's not just better -- it's not just better information. The CSOs are actually coming out of their pocket to pay, to acquire another signal. But if you look at the total mix of programming that they're carrying, this is actually where I think the answer resides in that both in the case of Dr. Israel and in the case of Dr. Crawford, the large -- the vast majority of the programming mix favors -actually favors almost all of the -- all of the other Claimants with the exception of JSC, I think in both cases. When it was reformulated, they get 4 percent in one and another one gets zero percent.

So I don't know if you have any other

Det	termination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket N	NO. 14	I-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018
	4572		4574
1	questions about that, but I think	1	CARP for 1978, 1979, 1983, 1989, and 1990 to
2	JUDGE STRICKLER: No.	2	92. So any formulation of the value of
3	MR. OLANIRAN: I'm being told that	3	programming that ignores the audience that
4	my time is up.	4	consumes such programs will be incomplete.
5	JUDGE BARNETT: Yes, it is.	5	Program Suppliers believe viewing is
6	MR. OLANIRAN: If I could just have	6	the most direct and most persuasive evidence of
7	two more minutes just to wrap up if that's	7	the relative market value of distant signal
8	okay.	8	programming. We think it's clear that
9	JUDGE BARNETT: That will be your	9:	fees-based regressions are fundamentally flawed
10	rebuttal.	10	•
11		11	as they relied on fees paid by the CSOs under
12	MR. OLANIRAN: The parties are	l.	the regulatory scheme. Bortz surveys are
	actually prohibiting me	12	fraught with issues including failure to
13	JUDGE BARNETT: Okay.	13	articulate a marketplace.
14	MR. OLANIRAN: from a rebuttal.	14	However, in the unlikely event that
15	They're banning me from having a rebuttal.	15	the Judges choose to accord weight to a survey
16	And so let me conclude with the	16	of CSOs, we believe also that they should we
17	following. I will continue to say this:	17	believe they should allow the Horowitz survey
18	Television was created so that people could	18	presented by Program Suppliers.
19	watch televised programs. Television would be	19	The record in this proceeding supports
20	dead today if no one had any if no one had	20	the basic form royalty allocation of Program
21	interest in watching.	21	Suppliers within the ratings identified in the
22	Viewing is paramount evidence of what	22	fourth column of the table that's on the
23	attracts and retains subscribers. There isn't	23	screen.
24	a single party in here whose clients don't care	24	For 2000-2010, it's 44.2 to 50.9,
25	about whether or not their content is being	25	which is the range of the Horowitz survey and
	4573		4575
1	consumed by an audience. That remains the case	1	Dr. Gray's regression results. For 2011, 39.79
2	whether the audience is local, distant, regular	2:	to 49.92. For 2012, 36.17 and 37.13. And for
3	cable network. It doesn't matter.	3 .	2013, for 36.05 to 45.09.
4	As the 1990-'92 CARP stated, it is	4	Once the Judges determine that the
5	disingenuous to say the cable system is	5	basic fund award, determine the basic fund
6	interested only in attracting subscribers but	6	awards, they should also determine that the
7	totally unconcerned with whether or not the	7:	3.75 Fund awards by adjusting the basic fund
8	subscriber, in fact, watches programming.	8	awards in a manner that accounts for PTV's
9	And I do understand that they gave	9	non-participation in the 3.75 Fund.
10	some weight to Bortz in that proceeding, but	10	Further, in light of the Music
11	they accorded Program Suppliers quite a few	11	Claimants' receipt of final distribution from
12	points above the their Bortz share in that	12	the Syndex Fund, Program Suppliers are the only
13	proceeding also.	13	other Claimant group participating in the
14	So when you when you took viewing	14	Syndex Fund, and therefore should be entitled
15	evidence, when you gave viewing evidence a	15	to 100 percent of the remaining Syndex Fund.
16	fresh look in the 2000-2003 distribution	16	And thank you for accommodating me for
17	proceeding, you said that viewership is the	17	a couple more minutes. That's all I have.
18	initial and predominant heuristic that a	18	
19	hypothetical CSO would consider in determining	19	Mr. Olaniran.
20		1	
20	whether to require a bundle of programs for	2.0	Now for rebuttal? Are you going in
22	distant retransmission subject to marginal	21	reverse order? That would be Mr. MacLean,
	adjustments needed to maximize viewership.	22	do you have any rebuttal?
23	And the D.C. Circuit agreed with you.	23	MR. MacLEAN: With your permission,
24 25	In fact, your view of viewing, no pun intended,	24	Your Honor. And I know I'm already over my
1/5	was the predominant view of the CRT and the	25	time. I could just take just a minute to

Det	ermination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket N	o. 14	-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018	
	4576		4578	
	11 Coloranda the and	1	MD CAMMEDETEID. In which come we	
1	address a point towards the end.	1 2	MR. SATTERFIELD: In which case, we have nothing.	
2	JUDGE BARNETT: One minute.	l	•	
3	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF	3	JUDGE BARNETT: Okay, thank you.	
4	SETTLING DEVOTIONAL CLAIMANTS	4	How about Public Television?	
5	MR. MacLEAN: Thank you, Your Honor.	5	Mr. Dove, ten minutes.	
6	I want to take one quick minute to address a	6	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
7	question from Judge Strickler regarding	7	PUBLIC TELEVISION CLAIMANTS	
8	Dr. Gray's dropping of the minimum fee systems.	8	MR. DOVE: Thank you, Your Honor, Your	
9	And I understand your point, Judge	9	Honors. Just a few points on the regression	
10	Strickler, if you carve out if you assume	10	criticisms.	
11	that the minimum fee systems are choosing first	11	First, it's important to remember that	
12	the programming they value most, then cutting	12	every time Mr. MacLean was talking about the	
13	those systems out might remove certain	13	word "systems," he was only talking about	
14	information. However, the effect that would	14	Dr. Israel's regression. Dr. Crawford, as you	
15	have on the regression is actually the opposite	15	know, only looked at or looked at subscriber	
16	of what you hypothesized. Because it's the	16	group level variation, which was a new	
17	minimum fee systems that pay the least, they	17	innovation that Dr. George testified made his	
18	would, by your hypothesis, be retransmitting	18	regression even more useful and precise and	
19	the highest number of minutes of programming by	19	addressed a number of the issues raised by	
20	proportion in terms of what they value. It	20	prior panels.	
21	would be the later systems that they add on	21	The question Mr. MacLean put up on the	
22	that would actually be positively associated	22	screen shows a fundamental misunderstanding, if	
23	with fees paid.	23	I understand the question correctly, of the	
24	I also want to point out with respect	24	regression analysis. He asked: Why would a	
25	to Dr. Gray dropping the minimum fee systems,	25	lower fee-paying system or subscriber group	
	4577		4579	
1	Dr. Crawford effectively does something very	1	chooses to retransmit more minutes of	
2	similar. His regression using fixed effects	2	programming that it does not value?	
3	effectively drops out all systems that have	3	No one is saying as I understand	
4	only a single subscriber group. That's about	4	it, no one is saying that the systems do not	
5	half of all systems in the universe. And	5	value the programming they're carrying more of.	
6	those, of course, are systematically different	6	They do value it. But the systems and	
7	than other systems because they're the ones	7	subscriber groups that are willing and able to	
8	that are least likely to be to be in	8	pay more have a different relative valuation,	
9	partially local, partially distant areas.	9	and the regressions attempt to calculate	
10	JUDGE STRICKLER: He dropped out	10	average relative valuations across the entire	
11	44 percent of the systems and 22 percent of the	11	country.	
12	subscriber groups or something along those	12	On the minimum fee issue, I just urge	
13	lines, right?	13	you to look at page 1424 of the transcript.	
14	MR. MacLEAN: Your Honor, it's	14	This is part of Dr. Crawford's testimony.	
15	something closer to between about 49 and	15	Dr. Gray simply did the calculations wrong.	
16	51 percent of the systems and approximately	16	And when Dr. Crawford corrected those	
17	15 percent of the observations, which would be	17	calculations, he got basically the same results	
18	which would be the number of subscriber	18	as in his own analyses.	
19	groups. My point is that these are	19	With regard to the various other	
20	systematically different than the systems that	20	criticisms, Your Honor, that have been made of	
21	have multiple subscriber groups. Thank you.	21	the regression analyses, we would just ask that	
22	JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you.	22	you would refer you to our proposed	
23	No one answered my question. Are you	23	findings, pages 12 to 18 of our proposed	
24	going in reverse order? So that means	24	findings and pages 7 to 11 of our response	
25	Canadians?	25	findings and to the record itself.	
L2J	Canaulans:	ina (TIMETING AND CO CHO LECOLA LEGELL.	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4580

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18:

19

20

21

22

23

8

9 :

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4582

Dr. Crawford and the other experts certainly do a much better job of explaining all this than I could ever do.

Just a couple other rebuttal points on other issues. Public Television is asking for significantly increased share from 2004-'05, and one could reasonably ask, well, you know, other than the quantitative studies, what evidence is there in the record supporting such a large increase?

And we would submit, Your Honors, that there's lots of evidence. And we -- as we said in our opening, the best of the best has gotten better. Public Television had record ratings in 2010 to '13. Multi-casting allowed for new niche channels of Public Television programming that CSOs valued and decided to carry distantly. Public Television came more distinctive as its look-alike channels moved towards reality programming and away from the type of programming that Public Television carried. Public Television had the best programming in at least six very important niches of programming in 2010 to '13 and constituted the largest volume of compensable

Television increased, what's the -- what's 2 happening behind the scenes to -- to -- that's

reflected in Dr. Crawford's regression, that's 3 : 4 what I'm trying to do. And so in that context, I think 5

looking at ratings is +- would be helpful. 6 7 JUDGE STRICKLER: Some sort of a 8. reality check?

MR. DOVE: A reality check, I like that term. I'm sure it will be used again here in a moment, but I think that would work in this context, yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Thank you. MR. DOVE: Other -- you know, a couple other reasons. Other types of distant signal carriage decreased while Public Television's increased. And then, as we've talked about, the amount of compensable programming on WGNA fell by half. And that's a lot of retransmissions that should no longer be receiving royalties. And that would be reflected in Public Television's increased share.

24 Another point that the Joint Sports 25 : Claimants have noted in their papers, and they

4581

4583

minutes of any category.

So we submit it's -- it's ridiculous, really, on its face that the Bortz survey estimated that Public Television's value was approximately the same as the Devotionals, which constitute only one niche, which as Dr. Gray testified is much less viewed than Public Television or any other category of programming.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Counsel, a moment ago as you were going through your litany of reasons why there should be an increase in the share that goes towards Public Television, one of the items that you mentioned were record ratings. So are you saying that we should rely on ratings as some measure of value in this proceeding?

MR. DOVE: I think it's helpful. What I'm trying to do with this is just sort of corroborate, you know, we're asking you to rely on the quantitative studies. Obviously, Dr. Crawford's regression is what we're asking you to rely on. But, you know, if one were to ask, well, does that make sense compared to what happened last time around, why has Public

1 may do so here again in a minute, is that in 2 2004-'05, Public Television supported the use 3 of the Bortz survey as adjusted by Mr.

McLaughlin to determine its share even though, 5 you know, many of the same alleged problems with the Bortz survey may have existed then. 6 7

So the question could be, one could ask, well, is there anything really different this time around? And we would -- we would submit that, yes, and as we said earlier this morning, lots of differences. You know, they fall into two categories. One is Bortz got worse, and then the other methods and data got a lot better.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Counsel became more inquisitive?

(Laughter.)

MR. DOVE: And counsel became more inquisitive. And we got some new associates who became even more inquisitive.

So I won't go through those again, but, you know, we believe that the Bortz survey has gotten worse in a variety of ways that are reflected in our papers and that Dr. Crawford's regression has gotten, you know, remarkably

	ermination of Cable Royalty Funds Docket N	10. I-	4-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018
	4584		4586
1	better.	1	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF
2	Finally, I guess in closing, Your	2	COMMERCIAL TELEVISION CLAIMANTS
3	Honor, as you may have heard, this year is the	3	MR. STEWART: I want to talk first
4	50th anniversary of Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood on	4	about a few things Mr. Olaniran said.
5	Public Television. The first broadcast was on	5	First, he made this plea at the end
ł.		6	about how everybody knows that cable television
6	February 19th, 1968. And in honor of that	7	is about viewing programming, programming
7	event, I thought I'd look to see if Mr. Rogers	1	that's to be consumed. But the problem is this
8	himself had ever said anything that would help	8	-
9	Your Honors in your decision-making here. As	9	is another one of those examples of misleading
10	it turns out, Mr. Rogers had an entirely	10	shorthands because that does not justify the
11	different view, take, on what value means than	11	unsubstantiated leap to saying therefore the
12	anything that we've heard in these proceedings.	12	relative value must be measured by how much
13	He told us that "it's not so much what	13	viewing is done.
14	we have in this life that matters, it's what we	14	We heard from Ms. Burdick that in her
15	do with what we have." So regardless of our	15	cable system, they look at the question of
16	award in these proceedings, the Public	16	whether any household how many households
17	Television Claimants are going to continue to	17	viewed any minute of programming on various
18	offer the best of the best programming for	18	channels. They ranked their channels based on
19	children and adults in history, drama, science,	19	how many households viewed once. They don't
20	and the arts. We're going to do the best we	20	look at the volume. It's not important.
21	can with what we have.	21	And, in fact, this is there is
22	And to that end, we respectfully	22	evidence in the record with regard to the
23	request that the Judges award Public Television	23	degree of advertising. In Exhibit 2005, at
24	the following shares of the basic fund in	24	page 5, note 7, which is Dr. Crawford's
25	accordance with Dr. Crawford's initial	25	rebuttal, he presents evidence about the fact
	4585		4587
1	analysis. 17 72 pargent for 2010	1	that about 94 percent of cable operator
1	analysis: 17.73 percent for 2010,	1	revenues are for subscriber fees and the rest
2	23.17 percent for 2011, 22.3 percent for 2012,	2 3	
3	and 23.49 percent for 2013.	1 3	is for advertising.
		1 4	Mar Olandana
4	Thank you for your time, Your Honors,	4	Mr. Olaniran
5	and for your courtesies in hearing our case.	5	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he
5 6	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you.	5 6	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just
5 6 7	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove.	5 6 7	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted.
5 6 7 8	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes.	5 6 7 8	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising.
5 6 7 8 9	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you.	5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry
5 6 7 8 9	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you	5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16.	5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a trip.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for overseeing Nielsen. She was active in the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a trip. (Laughter.)	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for overseeing Nielsen. She was active in the committee on research excellence and the Media
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a trip. (Laughter.) JUDGE BARNETT: I wish I had been here.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for overseeing Nielsen. She was active in the committee on research excellence and the Media Ratings Council. In 2009, she testified before Congress and was asked to oversee a committee
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a trip. (Laughter.) JUDGE BARNETT: I wish I had been here. MR. GARRETT: You just read my	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for overseeing Nielsen. She was active in the committee on research excellence and the Media Ratings Council. In 2009, she testified before Congress and was asked to oversee a committee to ensure that the rollout of a new technology
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and for your courtesies in hearing our case. Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Dove. Mr. Stewart? You reserved 15 minutes. MR. STEWART: Thank you. JUDGE BARNETT: But I think you actually saved 16. MR. STEWART: Yes. But I'm going to try to use fewer than 16. I'm just going in reverse order. Well, I just want to say that Mr. Garrett and I and maybe others in the room have the unique experience of cross-examining Mr. Rogers in one of these proceedings. It was a trip. (Laughter.) JUDGE BARNETT: I wish I had been here.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE STRICKLER: Just to clarify, he was referring to all cable, not not just well obviously, not distantly retransmitted. There's no new advertising. MR. STEWART: Correct. Cable industry in general, all of the cable networks on which advertising is permitted. Mr. Olaniran took a shot at Ceril Shagrin and said she has been out of Nielsen for 20 years. But, listen, she was instrumental in creating and rolling out the NPM's sample itself. She worked at Nielsen for 27 years, and for the past 20 years, she work at Univision and she was responsible for overseeing Nielsen. She was active in the committee on research excellence and the Media Ratings Council. In 2009, she testified before Congress and was asked to oversee a committee

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4588

1

2

4

5

4590

4591

ratings was accurate. So she is -- she knew what she was talking about.

Next Mr. Olaniran referred you to a Court of Appeals case. This was the 1990 to 1992 case, one case, 146 F.3d. If you look there, that was NAB arguing the following: The CARP panel intended to give us a share that was equal to the low end of our viewing, but they failed to make -- to correct the categorization errors that MPAA had made, so our minimum viewing fee should have been -- sorry -minimum viewing share should have been higher.

What the Court of Appeals said was that's not right because the CARP rejected viewing as the basis for making that award and they quoted language, on page 932, in which they referred to the fact that Program Suppliers agreed that viewing does not measure value.

Mr. Olaniran talked about data issues with respect to Dr. Gray and tried to minimize the effect of those. But apart from that there were substantial methodological errors made by Dr. Gray, and Dr. Bennett described them in some detail and showed how they resulted in

suggesting that the regression tells you something about systems, not programming.

3 : But this is -- this is the reason why

Dr. Israel said you can't make bivariate conclusions in a multi-variate context. That's

-- what that means is that the -- the

7 regressions themselves had controls. So, in

8 effect, what the regression asked was what is

9 the relative value of Devotional and all the 10 other program categories among subscriber

11 subgroups that are all in the same state, that

12 are all in the same -- in similar situations in terms of size, in terms of local broadcast 13

14 signals, in terms of location, because of the

15 fixed effects?

16 So -- so there is -- so turning that 17 regression into this simple, simplistic

18 statement that what this is measuring is

something that has to do with geographic 19

20 location or types of markets is simply not 21 correct.

22 Mr. MacLean also showed you that

23 6 percent number for CTV that came out of 24

Dr. Erdem's first manipulation. Dr. Erdem

disclaimed the rest of his manipulations after

4589

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

13

14

15

actual biased results in favor of -- that favored Program Suppliers.

The last thing that Mr. Olaniran mentioned was about how Dr. Gray reformulated Dr. Crawford's regression to eliminate the minimum fee systems. Well, he did more than reformulate it. He made an entirely new regression that didn't have fixed effects, that didn't use subscriber groups, and his results, which Dr. Gray said are similar, corroborate his viewing shares, are simply nonsense.

Now, going back to Mr. MacLean, Mr. MacLean continued in his closing argument to spin these hypotheses about why the Crawford regression might not actually be measuring what it says it measures. And I want -- instead of responding to each of them, I want to just refer the Judges to our response at paragraphs 18 to 26 because we took them, each of these sort of hypotheses, one at a time and explained with record cites why they're not correct.

But one of the -- you know, he showed this chart of the X and talked about his hypothesis that low fee systems -- and he also showed this religiosity map, which he was

being -- after it was pointed out that his -the variable he added to the numbers 2 through 6 was incorrect.

But even in that one, first of all, the case zero, which is on that same slide that Mr. MacLean showed, doesn't even match the Crawford regression. Dr. Erdem was doing something else but what he did in his -- his next case that showed the 6 percent was to replicate the royalty formula.

When you do that -- then he increased 11 12 his R squared, and when you do that, you basically suck all of the variability into the -- into the two very directly related variables that determine the royalties, and you make it 16 impossible to determine the relative 17 contribution of the things we're interested in, which are the -- which are the program 18 categories. And Dr. Crawford did do a sensitivity

19 20 test. He looked at what -- he looked at the 21 : 22 criticism that was made in the prior proceeding 23 and he did a test to see whether there was volatility across the years of his study and he

found that he did not, and that was reported in

25

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4592

1

2

3

6

7

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his study and in his testimony. Now, finally, I want to talk about PTV. And given all the love that Mr. Dove has given to the Crawford regression, this may seem a bit strange, but we are -- we're guided by the language in the '04-'05 case that I'll have

in a moment. It talks about -- and this is at page 57065 of the -- of 75 Federal Register. The Judges find that no single methodological approach, even when ostensibly adjusted to temper acknowledged shortcomings, persuasively obviates the need for relying at least to some small extent on other reasonable valuation approaches that offer additional perspective

from a different methodological vantage point. And we think that makes perfect sense. And, in fact, the Bortz survey, which asks the cable operators themselves or the buyers in this marketplace, is likely to extract information about other factors. You know, the cable operators know what extrinsic influences there might be when they -- when they provide those value measures. And so from our perspective, it makes perfect sense to use both

the reasonableness threshold to trigger the section of the '05 determination that you just auoted?

MR. STEWART: Yes, that's what we 4 5 believe.

And I guess one last point I'd like to make is that Mr. Dove made a point of saying that his proposed shares, unlike all the rest of us, does not maximize his share, but I want to say that, in fact, Dr. Crawford was quite clear that the better version of his regression was his non-duplication regression, what he called his final regression. And in that -- in that regression, the PTV share is somewhat smaller.

They were clear that they were recommending that he take Dr. Crawford's initial regression, but the fact -- in fact, the fact that duplicative network programming has no value has been confirmed in the testimony in this case, and we've provided specific record examples.

Do I have any more time? JUDGE BARNETT: Three minutes. MR. STEWART: Do you have any

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of them in this context of deciding --JUDGE STRICKLER: By both of them, you mean surveys and regressions?

MR. STEWART: I mean the Bortz survey and the Crawford regression, yes.

JUDGE STRICKLER: The other methodological applications or approaches don't fall within that general principle that you just cited from the case?

MR. STEWART: Well, I have spoken to the question of viewing, and I don't think that it should be given any weight. I think with respect to the Horowitz survey, which is an alternative, the problem with that is it's a constant sum survey, which says among these six categories, or however many categories are in a particular case, how do you allocate 100 percent. And for our category, they didn't provide any details. They didn't provide any examples, which means that all of the -- all of the valuations and the percentages are skewed in some way that we don't know. So we don't think the Horowitz survey is usable either. JUDGE STRICKLER: So you don't think

Horowitz or Dr. Gray's viewing approach meets

1 questions? 2 JUDGE STRICKLER: You said you 3 cross-examined Mr. Rogers? 4 (Laughter.)

> MR. STEWART: Well, so I followed Garrett. And Bob made the mistake of saying my son wanted to be here today but he couldn't, and then Mr. Rogers spent the next five or ten minutes inquiring after the health of Bob's

> > (Laughter.)

MR. GARRETT: He sent him a picture. JUDGE BARNETT: So Mr. Rogers, I knew because I grew up in the 50s outside Pittsburgh, got his start on Commercial Television. So he was there behalf of Public Television, and I wanted to just say: So you actually did this as well on Commercial Television.

But I knew that if I just asked him that, he'd then would keep going. So I followed that question immediately with a question about how Josie Carey was. And Josie Carey was his sidekick on the early version of

of each type of programming. And that whole discussion was sort of sed in part because of past criticisms as Bortz survey doesn't measure the side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed so that was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what bothetical marketplace would look like. It is a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply so not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
And that whole discussion was sort of sed in part because of past criticisms as Bortz survey doesn't measure the side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
And that whole discussion was sort of sed in part because of past criticisms as Bortz survey doesn't measure the side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what be othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
ed in part because of past criticisms ed Bortz survey doesn't measure the side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what bethetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
e Bortz survey doesn't measure the side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
side, doesn't even take the sellers' tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
tive into account. What they were no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what bethetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
no, it's really in this hypothetical it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
it's the demand side that's important. And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
And that's missing from the tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route — what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
tion that Mr. Olaniran gave. It's from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
from their description of the tical marketplace in their proposed s. That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
tical marketplace in their proposed That was really the critical cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
cance of articulating what route what othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply so not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
othetical marketplace would look like. a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply so not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
a real key was figuring out what the side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
side is. The sellers' side or supply s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
s not as significant. And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
And I see up on his list of sms, he still has that same criticism
sms, he still has that same criticism
73 1, 3
ell, it only measures willingness to
doesn't really measure the supply side.
4599
nd that's what gave them particular
tz isn't really connected with the
CH TOIL & TOUTTA COMMOCION MITCH CITE
tical marketplace, that's directly
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding.
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of S. And what the Librarian and,
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13.
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the able distribution CARP to describe in
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the dble distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the dble distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining lace value, it is not the first time the
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the able distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining lace value, it is not the first time the c factors comprising the discussion of
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the able distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining lace value, it is not the first time the c factors comprising the discussion of othetical marketplace have been
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the able distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining lace value, it is not the first time the c factors comprising the discussion of othetical marketplace have been ed.
tical marketplace, that's directly y to what the judge the CARP found in 8-'99 proceeding. Program Suppliers did not like that They appealed to the Librarian of s. And what the Librarian and, tally, that discussion in the of the port, it's here in Exhibit 6032, and pages 10 through 13. When they appealed, the Librarian d the challenges that the Program rs made and said, while this is the able distribution CARP to describe in its construct for determining lace value, it is not the first time the c factors comprising the discussion of othetical marketplace have been
nd that's what gave them particular nce in relying upon Bortz. So when Mr. Olaniran talks about how

out of thin air.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

buy programming in a marketplace in which the

say, therefore, it cannot be said the CARP in

hypothetical marketplace and, in particular, the conclusion that this is the -- it is the

perspective of the cable operators that best

programming would work, the panel's actions are

JUDGE STRICKLER: Now going full

MR. GARRETT: This is a determination

with the panel's consideration of the

determines how different categories of

circle to I think what I asked you this

just read to us, what the Librarian said

morning, are you saying that that, what you

constitutes binding precedent on us or just

that has been made. I don't think it's a

based on prior decisions.

persuasive findings of fact?

cable license did not exist. And it goes on to

this proceeding manufactured an economic theory

While Program Suppliers may disagree

4600

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here. And he testified that, yes, in the end 1 you have to come back to what it is the cable 2 3 operator was looking at. That's at page 3780 of the transcript. 4 5

That's what the Bortz survey does. It measures -- that's what Mr. Trautman says. It really measures the demand of the cable operators, and it has been doing it for a very long time.

And that just gets me into the viewing part of it here. Again, Mr. Olaniran talked for 35 minutes here about viewing. But he still didn't answer the fundamental question of where is the record evidence that shows that cable operators reflect their demand for programming in these kinds of viewing numbers? There is no such evidence in this proceeding here.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Wasn't there some designated testimony to that effect? I forget the woman's name. About the cable systems and viewing, came out of a satellite.

JUDGE FEDER: Toby.

JUDGE STRICKLER: Toby, yes. Thank

you. Nathan --

approach the hypothetical marketplace. And unless there's actual evidence in this record here, and I don't believe there is any, that

matter of fact. It talks about how one should

4601

1 JUDGE FEDER: Berlin.

> JUDGE STRICKLER: Toby Berlin. That was testimony to that effect, wasn't it?

> > MR. GARRETT: I --

JUDGE STRICKLER: Regardless of what weight we ultimately put on it.

MR. GARRETT: I don't think it was quantifiable, quantitative evidence that said this is the same measure of the viewing. In any event, Your Honor, I wasn't there in that proceeding. I never had any opportunity to cross-examine her or most of the other people here. That was their Phase II proceeding.

I'm saying I'm looking at the record of this proceeding here and the witnesses that testified and the information that I discussed earlier today, and it does not support the notion that there is this one-to-one correlation between viewing and value.

And I also don't think it's a reality check. If you want a reality check, I mean, this survey here is showing something like 27 points lower for sports than even the Horowitz survey. And over 30 odd points less -- 36 points less than something like Bortz.

shows that it should be something completely different, I think that's a determination that that ought to be followed.

JUDGE STRICKLER: So you think that was a principle of law that was established as opposed to a principle -- a factual finding?

MR. GARRETT: I think it was a mixed question of law and fact, is what they were -basically determined.

JUDGE STRICKLER: And it's your position -- you're advocating that we're bound by that?

MR. GARRETT: I never advocate to a panel that they're bound by something. I think that, in fact, you know, if there are differences in the record, you can always, if you articulate a reasoned decision, change it. But I'm saying there is nothing in the record here that warrants a departure of the method. There's nothing that warrants a departure from the notion that it is the demand of the cable operator that really determines what the relative marketplace value is.

And, in fact, Your Honor yourself asked that question of Dr. Gray when he was

> Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

4603

Determination of Cable Ro	yany runus Docket in	0. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010-	P
1	19 [1] 4461: 18	22.3 [1] 4585: 2	4596 [1] 4607 :13
<u> </u>	1968 [1] 4584: 6	23.17 [1] 4585: 2	49 [1] 4577: 15
// [1] 4585 :25	1978 [1] 4574:1	23.49 [1] 4585: 3	49.92 [1] 4575:2
0	1979 [3] 4411: 24 4456: 17 4574: 1	24 [1] 4400: 17	5
04-'05 [16] 4421:11 4427:24 4442:	1980s [1] 4459:14	25 [5] 4417: 15 4420: 15 4427: 6	
20 4444:14 4445:5 4446:13.20	1983 [1] 4574:1	4428 :4 4564 :16	5 [1] 4586:24
	1988 [1] 4489:20	2500 [1] 4401: 15	5.52 [2] 4415:21 4416:15
4448:7 4457:2 4461:22 4462:23	1989 [1] 4574:1	26 [2] 4470 :24 4589 :19	5.9 [2] 4428:2,2
4479 :8,14 4485 :6 4557 :10 4592 :6 05 [1] 4594 :2	1990 [2] 4574:1 4588:4	262,800 [1] 4516:19	5:00 [1] 4475:17
	1990-'92 [2] 4552:15 4573:4	27 [3] 4407 :21 4587 :17 4603 :22	50 [4] 4434:14 4460:11 4472:11,12
1	1992 [1] 4588: 5	28 [1] 4431 :24	50.9 [1] 4574:24
1 [2] 4427:13 4486:12	1998 [2] 4420:24 4421:4	29 [1] 4470 :24	50s [1] 4595:14
1.95 [2] 4415:8 4416:8	1998-'99 [3] 4464:24 4597:13	2b [2] 4561: 20,25	50th [1] 4584:4
1:38 [1] 4524:23	4599:7	3	51 (1) 4577:16
1:47 [3] 4414:2 4501:23 4524:24	19th [1] 4584:6		530 [1] 4403:11
10 [2] 4427:16 4599:13	2	3 [3] 4487:9 4557:20 4562:3	56 [1] 4415:24
10:58 [1] 4463:22		3.75 [6] 4417:24 4418:1 4463:15	57065 [1] 4592:9
100 [4] 4422:19 4533:4 4575:15	2 [8] 4415:11,16 4427:13 4454:9,10,	· ·	59 [1] 4475:7
4593:18	18 4546:6 4591:2	3:00 [1] 4426:9	6
1001 [2] 4401:23 4431:24	2.9 [1] 4407:21	3:35 [1] 4606:9	6 [5] 4415:21 4519:14 4590:23
1002 [1] 4462:4	20 [7] 4449:18,19 4546:22 4548:5	30 [3] 4407:12 4463:25 4603:24	4591:3,9
101 [1] 4400:15	4564 :16 4587 :14,17	30-minute [1] 4437:17	601 [1] 4401:9
106 [9] 4529 :6,6,13,18 4530 :1,12,	200 [1] 4403:11	300 [1] 4403:5	6032 [1] 4599:12
23 4531:9,9	2000 [1] 4429:7	302 [1] 4539:24	62 [1] 4454:24
11 [3] 4434:24 4462:12 4579:24	2000-2003 [1] 4573:16	31.5 [1] 4407 :10	626-795-6001 [1] 4403:13
11.98 [1] 4457:25	2000-2010 [1] 4574:24	33 [3] 4469:19 4476:15 4604:21	69 [1] 4489:21
11:20 [1] 4463:23	20001 [2] 4401:10 4402:20	35 [2] 4427 :8 4602 :12	
11:52 [1] 4487:14	20004 [1] 4401:24	36 [1] 4603:24	7
1101 [1] 4461:20	20006 [1] 4403:6	36.05 [1] 4575:3	7 [3] 4430 :12 4579 :24 4586 :24
111 [19] 4527 :12 4530 :6,11,23	2002 [1] 4429:7	36.17 [1] 4575:2	70 [1] 4553: 20
4531:9 4532:17 4533:25 4534:17	2003 [1] 4479:6	36.6 [1] 4407:2	703 [1] 4403: 19
4536:3,23 4538:23 4543:2 4557:	20036 [3] 4402:10 4403:20 4404:8	3606 [1] 4489:21	75 [1] 4592: 9
24 4558:1,20 4562:2,4,6 4565:1	20037 [1] 4401:16	365 [1] 4553:24	77 [1] 4475: 8
119 [2] 4418:6,7	2004 [3] 4462:8,12 4555:24	37.13 [1] 4575:2	8
12 [5] 4418 :10 4458 :2 4462 :12	2004-'05 [6] 4464:13 4465:6 4471:	37.5 [1] 4407:6	
4512 :12 4579 :23	10 4580:6 4583:2 4605:6	3780 [1] 4602:3	8 [2] 4473:14 4555:24
12:50 [1] 4487: 13	2005 [1] 4586:23	38.2 [1] 4406:24 39.79 [1] 4575:1	80 [1] 4553:20
12:58 [1] 4487: 15	2009 [1] 4587:21		803(a [1] 4489:5
1200 [1] 4404:7	2010 [17] 4405:6 4431:11 4437:10	3945 [1] 4455:19	84 [1] 4604:19
1233 [1] 4403: 19	4445:6 4446:19 4458:1 4471:9 4472:10 4474:13 4545:21 4551:2	4	85 [1] 4476:25
13 [10] 4438 :23 4445 :6 4471 :9		4 [3] 4553:11 4562:5 4571:23	850 [1] 4402:19 .
4472: 10 4474: 14 4516: 7 4557: 19	4553:25 4564:10,17 4580:15,24	4.5 [1] 4428:2	8th [1] 4402:9
4580: 15,24 4599: 13	4585:1 2010-'13 [2] 4431:18 4464:13	4/25/18 [2] 4608 :9.12	9
13.2 [1] 4473:1 8	2010-13 [2] 4431:18 4464:13	40 [7] 4416:12 4427:9 4431:2 4434:	9 [1] 4454:5
14 [2] 4516: 1,2	2010 -2013 [2] 4416:5 4427:22 2011 [5] 4458:2 4564:15,18 4575:1	18,20 4541: 11 4546: 19	9:41 [2] 4400:19 4405:2
14-month [1] 4564:12	2011 9 4458:2 4564:15,18 4575:1	4054 [1] 4456:7	90 [1] 4460:11
1424 [1] 4579 :13	4565:2 2012 [3] 4564:17 4575:2 4585:2	4055 [1] 4456:7	907 [1] 4552:13
143,770 [1] 4431:15	2013 [10] 4405 :6 4446 :19 4473 :21	44 [4] 4415:22 4416:12 4469:8	91101 [1] 4403:12
146 [2] 4552 :13 4588 :5	4545:22 4551:2 4553:25 4564:11,	4577:11	92 [1] 4574:2
15 向 4405 :18 4440 :13,19 4524 :15	18 4575: 3 4585: 3	44.2 [1] 4574:24	931 [2] 4552:14,14
4577: 17 4585: 8	2018 [1] 4400:17	4405 [1] 4607:3	932 [2] 4552:14 4588:16
15-minute [1] 4463:20	202-355-6432 [1] 4403:7	4440 [1] 4607:4	94 [1] 4587:1
150 [1] 4553:7	202-355-7917 [1] 4402:11	4464 [1] 4607:5	98 [2] 4415:25 4479:4
16 6 4524:16,17 4585:11,13 4604:	202-408-7600 [1] 4403:21	4478 [1] 4607:6	98-'99 [2] 4557:10 4598:24
15,20	202-408-7600 (174403.21	4483 [1] 4607:7	99 [4] 4434:5 4479:4 4489:20 4555
1629 [1] 4403 :5	202-624-2665 [1] 4401:25	4488 [1] 4607:15	24
17 [2] 4449: 20 4461: 2	202-626-6666 [1] 4402:21	45 [4] 4437 :1,6 4438 :8 4469 :8	
17.4 [1] 4553:8	202-663-8183 [1] 4404:9	45.09 [1] 4575: 3	A
17.73 [1] 4585:1	202-942-5000 [1] 4401:11	4525 [1] 4607:8	a.m [7] 4400:19 4405:2 4426:9
18 [2] 4579: 23 4589: 19	20th [1] 4403:19	4576 [1] 4607:10	4463:22,23 4475:17 4487:14
18.8 (1) 4469:18	21 [1] 4518:20	4578 [1] 4607:11	abilities [1] 4480:23
1818 [1] 4402:9	22 [2] 4457 :10 4577 :11	4586 [1] 4607: 12	ability [8] 4513:14,16 4514:8,22,24
	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	

4554:16.18 4608:5 able [3] 4492:10 4512:19 4579:7 above [2] 4573:12 4604:7 absence [2] 4549:23 4550:23 absent [4] 4527:11 4528:5 4533: 25 4543:2 absolute [1] 4504:11 absolutely [3] 4406:16 4496:15 4522:16 absorbs [1] 4555:1 abstract [1] 4527:25 absurd [4] 4491:24 4503:25 4509: 25 4518:18 academic [2] 4421:23 4423:23 accept [4] 4520:1 4540:23 4565:1 4570:19 accepted [2] 4422:6 4437:24 accepting [2] 4553:16,17 accommodating [1] 4575:16 accord [5] 4413:1 4421:16 4438:2 4552:5 4574:15 accordance [4] 4488:21 4489:4, 17 4584:25 accorded [1] 4573:11 according [4] 4434:11 4535:14 4539:13 4542:9 accordingly [1] 4410:12 accords [1] 4530:16 account [5] 4407:1 4439:2 4517:2 4518:25 4598:6 accounted [3] 4415:8.20 4569:4 accounting [1] 4449:9 accounts [1] 4575:8 accurate [4] 4464:22 4498:11 4588:1 4608:4 accustomed [1] 4490:20 acknowledge [2] 4476:19 4514:4 acknowledged [1] 4592:12 acknowledges [3] 4414:3 4430: 20 4432:17 acquire [5] 4416:3 4537:9,20 4542: 18 4571:13 acquired [1] 4416:4 acquires [2] 4451:17 4537:6 across [13] 4445:17 4451:5 4469: 15 4481:14 4482:20 4512:15.17 4523:2 4563:18,19 4564:2 4579: 10 4591:24 act [6] 4408:23 4410:12 4488:20 **4489:**3,17 **4529:**6 acting [1] 4597:7 actions [1] 4600:12 active [1] 4587:19 activity [1] 4550:15 actual [14] 4438:13 4445:21 4457: 7,12,16 4458:17 4459:1,2 4467:7, 15 4537:24 4556:20 4589:1 4600: actually [62] 4421:20 4422:14 4427:11.21 4447:4.6 4451:7.14.18 4453:15 4454:3 4455:5.17.22.24.

25 4467:21 4475:13 4477:12 4488:12 4490:18 4498:8,23 4499: 4,6 **4503**:15,17 **4516**:3,7,16 **4517**: 16 4518:12 4524:16 4533:25 4535:16 4538:9,17 4541:22 4547: 18 4549:17 4552:25 4553:18 4556:18 4563:3 4565:12 4568:19 **4570:**17 **4571:**12.16.20 **4572:**12 4576:15,22 4585:11 4587:25 4589:15 4595:18 4605:9 ad [2] 4470:19 4516:8 add [5] 4490:24 4503:9,11 4518:7 4576:21 added [2] 4545:13 4591:2 addition [1] 4417:22 additional [8] 4444:20 4451:17 4524:14.15 4534:22.25 4571:4 4592:15 address [10] 4445:2 4471:15 4473: 15 4488:17 4490:21 4491:14 **4526:**3,10 **4576:**1.6 addressed [3] 4417:8 4578:19 4599:22 addresses [1] 4446:6 adequately [1] 4477:4 adjoin [1] 4453:9 adjourned [2] 4606:8,10 adjust [1] 4469:10 adjusted [6] 4406:25 4439:2 4440: 8 4463:7 4583:3 4592:11 adjusting [2] 4421:13 4575:7 adjustment [7] 4407:2 4418:6 4421:6 4463:13 4470:14 4486:23 4500:6 adjustments [9] 4443:4 4462:2 4463:3 4466:19 4470:20.20 4477: 19 4522:20 4573:22 adjusts [3] 4421:2,2 4498:4 ADKINS [1] 4401:7 administrative [2] 4531:24 4532: administratively [1] 4532:24 admit [1] 4517:5 admits [1] 4510:4 admitted [3] 4450:7 4516:23 4544: adopt [6] 4442:15 4469:20 4479:5 4519:11,17 4521:17 adopted [11] 4405:7,8 4410:15 4411:24 4418:1,9 4429:6 4479:7 4501:10 4509:6 4533:22 adoption [1] 4482:25 adults [1] 4584:19 advancements [1] 4548:8 adversaries [1] 4527:2 advertising [22] 4419:10,19,20 4425:18 4541:17 4542:22,24,25 **4543:**1,5,8,14,15,17,25 **4544:**4,8 **4586:**23 **4587:**3,8,11 **4597**:18 advertising-based [4] 4421:14 advocate [1] 4601:13

advocating [3] 4476:16 4558:17

4601:11 affirmatively [1] 4436:21 afternoon [4] 4426:6 4525:1,2 4607:15 afterthought [1] 4486:9 aggregation [1] 4547:23 ago [5] 4408:15 4527:18 4546:22 4548:5 4581:11 agree [13] 4467:10 4471:3.6 4507: 13 4517:1,19 4527:4 4535:16,25 **4536**:16,17 **4565**:2,16 agreed [7] 4424:9 4464:11 4465:6 4501:16 4531:12 4573:23 4588: agreement [5] 4405:7,8 4525:19, 21 4555:18 agrees [3] 4456:7 4474:10 4565:7 Ah [2] 4520:25 4521:1 ahead [7] 4406:9,15 4420:20 4428: 12 4521:19 4524:5 4525:22 air [5] 4534:12 4536:23,24 4542:19 4600:5 aired [3] 4530:4 4546:2,3 ALAN [1] 4401:3 ALBINA [1] 4402:6 ALESHA [1] 4402:5 alleged [2] 4523:7 4583:5 allocate [7]4416:5 4463:10 4493: 20,25 4507 13 4521 19 4593 17 allocated [2] 4424:10 4558:7 allocating [2] 4527:5 4558:16 allocation [21] 4405 5 4408:10 4411:9 4428:14 4429:4 4430:16 4441:12,25 4442:18,21 4444:6 4448:1 4453:10 4459:23 4466:9 4494:5 4531:21 4540:12 4552:9, 16 4574:20 allocations [7] 4441:4,8 4442:16 4557:7 4559:17 4560:9 4561:9 allow 5 4416:3 4419:19 4487:1 4543:14 4574:17 allowed [5] 4446:4 4543:5 4554: 20,23 **4580**:15 allows 2 4532:22 4543:11 almost [4] 4541:11 4546:22 4548: 5 4571:20 alone 2 4453:18.22 already [5] 4420:20 4488:11 4490: 25 4569:2 4575:24 alternative [2] 4518:6 4593:14 although 6 4420:20 4488:22 4515:2 4548:11 4555:20 4557:9 among [12] 4446:7 4449:19 4459: 24 4495:11,12 4496 16,18 4501: 23 4566:11 23 4590 10 4593:15 amount [13] 4423:12 4426:4 4427: 18 4431:13,25 4437:10 4472:20 4475:11 4480:21 4481:24 4486: 15 4514:10 4582:18 amounts [1] 4453:2 analogies [2] 4418:2 4433:1 analogous 5 4417:5 4425:17,19

4426:17 4439:17 analogy [3] 4417:2 4419:7 4424:7 analyses [9] 4417:17 4425:11 4442:9 4443:17 4465:3 4471:19 4522:15 4579:18,21 analysis [49] 4417:16 4418:13 4420:1 4422:16 4432:7 4441:13 4444:18 4445:8.18 4447:1 4450:8. 10 4454:8.15 4462:20 4464:20 4465:2,14,20 4466:5 4467:14 4468:11,13,24 4469:7,14,22 4471: 5 4477:23 4499:11 4500:13 4516: 18 4541:10 4542:8 4545:6,18 4546:5,7,20 4549:11,14,16,18 4553:6 4565:7 4568:23 4578:24 4585:1 4604:25 analyze [2] 4409:10 4509:9 analyzing [1] 4553:21 ancestry [1] 4482:5 animal [1] 4483:23 ANN [1] 4401:21 anniversary [1] 4584:4 anomalies [1] 4433:8 another [19] 4411;2 4427;16 4429; 25 4435:4,12 4472:20 4483:4 4496:22 4506:13 4510:13 4511: 16,22 4518:9 4544:22 4567:12 4571:13,23 4582:24 4586:9 answer [13] 4419:23 4439:8 4459: 6 4490:16 4492:10,12 4493:3 4503:2 4517:18 4523:16 4562:17 4571:16 4602:13 answered [2] 4474:22 4577:23 answering [1] 4501:13 answers [3] 4464:21 4520:16 4528:8 antithesis [1] 4532:4 anybody [1] 4497:20 anyway [5] 4565:6 4566:5 4567:5 4568:10 4569:14 apart [2] 4456:14 4588:22 apparently [2] 4499:1 4512:11 appeal [1] 4552:15 appealed [2] 4599:9,14 Appeals [3] 4429:21 4588:4,13 APPEARANCES [3] 4402:1 4403: 1 4404:1 appearing [2] 4548:14,15 appears [1] 4597:1 applicability [1] 4531:25 applicable [1] 4528:1 application [1] 4548:10 applications [1] 4593:7 applied [2] 4480:24 4485:6 applies [2] 4429:14 4488:25 apply [5] 4409:8 4425:21 4499:15 4516:8,13 appointed [1] 4410:20 appreciate [1] 4484:20 approach [22] 4415:18 4429:2 4439:4 4442:19 4446:5,6 4452:24

25 4457:24 4458:8 4460:1 4466:

4458:22 4465:25 4478:22 4479:5,

12.17 4481:1 4491:6 4497:21 4507:23 4527:23 4540:8 4592:11 4593:25 4600:23 approaches [7] 4441:20 4527:15, 20 4528:18 4531:1 4592:15 4593: appropriate [12] 4411:10 4433:11 4454:1 4458:13 4463:7 4477:16 4517:20 4540:7,14 4547:10,12 4605:3 approximately [4] 4553:7.16 4577:16 4581:5 April [1] 4400:17 apt [1] 4493:11 arbitrary [4] 4459:9 4470:20 4471: 2 4552:4 Arbitron [1] 4587:24 area [2] 4480:2 4510:20 areas [4] 4482:8 4513:21 4514:6 4577:9 Aren't [6] 4495:16 4512:6 4566:18 4567:14 4570:12 4605:19 arguably [3] 4483:12 4514:14,16 argue [3] 4458:10 4501:12 4553:6 argued [4] 4459:13,21 4552:17 4553:1 arguing [1] 4588:6 ARGUMENT [32] 4405:21 4417:2 4435:22 4440:21 4464:5 4478:15 4488:9 4491:15 4502:8 4507:1,9, 14,16,17,19,21 4510:20 4523:24 4524:12 4525:23 4528:23 4549: 24 4552:23 4564:21,24 4565:17 4567:18 4576:3 4578:6 4586:1 4589:13 4596:13 Arguments [8] 4405:4,10 4406:6 4486:21.22 4528:14 4607:2.9 Arizona [1] 4596:3 Arnold [2] 4401:8 4403:16 around [5] 4474:6 4480:13 4581: 25 4583:9 4605:13 arrangement [1] 4534:14 arrangements [1] 4536:11 arrived [2] 4450:18 4465:19 arrives [1] 4448:21 article [1] 4509:14 articulate [5] 4556:10 4557:2 4563:15 4574:13 4601:17 articulated 5 4534:1 4556:3 4597:15,16 4598:24 articulating [1] 4598:14 articulation [2] 4533:19 4539:21 arts [1] 4584:20 aside [3] 4434:4 4437:10 4477:21 asks [2] 4453:5 4592:18 aspect [1] 4512:20 assign [1] 4554:15 associated [5] 4478:21 4530:8 4551:11,14 4576:22 associates [1] 4583:19

22 4570:2 4576:10 assumed [1] 4569:6 assuming [2] 4419:14 4563:2 assured [1] 4606:6 attached [1] 4413:6 attacking [1] 4448:12 attempt [2] 4444:4 4579:9 attempted [2] 4444:7 4599:25 attempts [1] 4453:1 attention [2] 4440:25 4460:25 attracting [2] 4449:24 4573:6 attraction [1] 4542:15 attracts [3] 4422:15,21 4572:23 audience [11] 4422:13,22 4431:15 4458:24 4541:1,2,10 4549:7 4573: 1 2 4574:3 audiovisual [2] 4529:9.14 augmentation [3] 4482:14 4485: 12.18 augmented [7] 4442:24 4443:5 4461:18 4462:19 4463:5 4473:13 4485:7 availability [5] 4496:19,20,21 4497:3 4505:22 available [8] 4446:3 4473:25 4479: 18 4480:10 4481:16 4507:23 4549:20 4597:19 availed [1] 4558:2 Avenue [4] 4400:15 4401:9,23 4403:11 average [7] 4469:5 4470:4 4476:6 4504:25 4510:22 4563:10 4579: avidity [1] 4421:5 avoid [1] 4530:7 avoids [1] 4467:5 award [10] 4479:16 4485:8.10 4486:19 4487:1 4575:5 4584:16. 23 4588:15 4604:5 awarding [1] 4467:17 awards [6] 4466:10 4478:1 4552:9 4575:6,7,8 aware [1] 4479:6 away [4] 4412:9 4518:8 4543:7 4580:20 axis [1] 4494:10 back [15] 4417:22 4425:3 4432:19

dack [16] 4417:22 4425:3 4432:19 4443:1,6 4483:7,10 4499:9 4509: 11 4512:25 4522:4 4524:7 4589: 12 4597:13 4602:2 backed [1] 4501:23 bad [5] 4433:22 4493:14 4520:21, 21,22 balance [1] 4462:19 banning [1] 4572:15 BARNETT [46] 4400:9 4405:3,15, 19 4406:4,12 4415:12 4423:20,25 4424:7 4426:23 4434:19 4440:14, 20 4463:18,24 4464:4 4478:6,8,11 4487:3,6,10 4488:2 4523:18,21 4524:2,17,25 4525:6,9,18 4538:2

4572:5,9,13 4575:18 4576:2 4577: 22 4578:3 4585:7,10,21 4594:24 4595:13 4596:10 4605:12,17 base [5] 4423:1 4443:10 4485:7,10, Baseball [4] 4406:1 4415:16 4475: 19 4526:21 based [30] 4409:14 4443:14.16 4445:4.14 4447:2 4448:23 4449: 23 4452:14 4459:18,25 4468:22 4469:6 4494:15 4497:2,3 4505:18 **4514:**24 **4520:**19 **4522:**19 **4532:** 13 4547:20 4565:8,8,24 4566:17 **4570:4 4586:18 4600:13 4604:**5 basic [9] 4469:10 4499:10 4511:25 4574:20 4575:5,5,7 4584:24 4597: basically [8] 4423:3 4463:10 4491: 17 4495:10 4500:8 4579:17 4591: 13 4601:9 basis [18] 4408:9,24 4418:21 4442: 12 4443:4 4451:24 4453:18 4456: 11.19.23 4466:9 4478:1 4489:25 4523:13 4530:2 4570:23 4588:15 4604:15 basketball [2] 4415:16 4526:20 beans [1] 4433:3 bears [1] 4530:23 became [3] 4583:15.18.20 become [6] 4411:3 4445:5 4471: 19 4484:4 4521:14 4551:5 becoming [1] 4521:15 began [2] 4439:17 4445:13 begin [1] 4405:20 beginning 3 4405:11 4483:11 4488:18 begins [1] 4451:17 behalf [14] 4401:2.18 4402:2.13 4403:2,15 4404:2 4407:7 4440:23 **4464:**7 **4540:**10 **4548:**14 **4576:**3 4595:16 behavior [2] 4467:7.16 behind [1] 4582:2 belabor [2] 4432:21 4520:6 believe [24] 4439:7 4442:11 4443: 18 4453:3 4464:20 4491:4.7 4523: 5,16 **4525**:8 **4526**:21 **4528**:7,8,16 4547:24,25 4548:1 4551:14 4574: 5,16,17 4583:22 4594:5 4600:25 believes [1] 4605:3 bench [1] 4405:24 benchmarking [2] 4425:13 4426: benchmarks [1] 4425:16 benefit [3] 4531;24 4546;18 4555; BENJAMIN [1] 4403:17

Bennett [3] 4457:9 4467:22 4588:

best [29] 4464:21 4465:25 4466:1

4467:15,17,20 4468:4 4473:22

Berlin [2] 4603:1,2

April 24, 2018 4523:16 4528:8,22 4533:19 4542: 4,14 4547:12,13,13 4558:13 4568: 8,12 4570:5 4580:13,13,22 4584: 18,18,20 4600:10 4608:4 better [17] 4426:11 4438:12 4467: 4 4469:2 4511:6 4554:9.21 4555: 22 4571:1.4.11.11 4580:2.14 4583: 14 4584:1 4594:11 between [29] 4412:13 4414:4 4416:6 4418:15 4422:1 4427:8 4435:20 4462:9,13 4463:5,11 4494:24 4502:17 4504:12 4519: 13 4523:15 4530:23 4536:8 4539: 3 4544:13 4545:23 4547:17 4550: 16 4554:19 4561:8 4570:15 4577: 15 4597:7 4603:19 beyond [3] 4543:25 4565:13 4571: bias [5] 4459:5 4472:13 4522:22 4556:12 4564:10 biased [5] 4471:7,23 4472:6,7 4589:1 biases [9] 4470:17 4473:12,15,17, 19,24 4491:11 4522:21 4523:15 big [1] 4431:18 bigger [5] 4428:1,2,8 4494:1,2 biggest [3] 4435:17 4453:20 4549: billions [1] 4520:14 binding [1] 4600:18 bit [9] 4422:16 4427:25 4432:5 4488:23 4500:6 4554:6 4555:8 4592:5 4597:2 bivariate [1] 4590:4 bloody [1] 4526:7 blue [1] 4460:13 Board [3] 4410:16.23 4563:19 boat [1] 4517:24 Bob [2] 4405:23 4595:6 Bob's [1] 4595:9 Boggs [1] 4401:14 boil [1] 4442:4 bonus [1] 4406:13 boom [1] 4500:11 borne [1] 4426:1 Bortz [127] 4406:23 4407:17 4413: 8,10,13 4426:1,19,20 4428:21 4430:6 4431:23 4435:20,21 4436: 6,18 4438:21,24 4439:1,7 4440:3, 7,11 4441;12 4442;8,24 4443;5,20 4444:13,15,19 4446:23,24 4447:9, 19,22 4448:6,25 4461:18 4462:19 4463:5 4465:15 4469:23 4470:2, 22 4471:7,13,21 4472:1,5,9,22 4473:1,13 4474:2,14,17,21 4475:3, 14,25 4476:3,6,10,21 4477:1 4479: 9 4482:14,15,24 4483:9,11 4484: 12,24 4485:5,7 4486:11,12 4491:8, 9 4519:13 4522:18 4523:11 4554: 6,9,17,19,22,25 4555:4,14,16

Association [2] 4526:20 4552:12

assume [5] 4416:2 4511:11 4565:

4556:3,4,8,25 **4557**:2,3,11,13

4559:3,5 4561:19,24 4562:9,11,12,

20 4563:19 4564:1,4,10 4573:10, 12 4574:11 4581:3 4583:3,6,12,22 4592:18 4593:4 4598:4 4599:2,4, 23 4602:5 4603:25 Bortz' [1] 4473:8 both [29] 4426:17,20 4441:2 4443: 11 4444:10 4445:1,3 4449:1 4461: 25 4476:4 4487:11 4491:8 4496: 20 4501:1 4504:1 4517:6,12 4521: 14 4526:8 4533:23 4535:25 4536: 13 4549:1 4556:13 4564:3 4571: 17,22 **4592:**25 **4593:**2 bothering [1] 4568:4 bottom [3] 4432:15 4440:5 4516: bought [1] 4415:7 bound [5] 4428:15 4430:1 4445:23 4601:11,14 break [2] 4487:13 4488:6 brief [2] 4441:6 4552:4 briefly [5] 4407:24 4430:9 4434:15 4441:20 4467:19 bring [2] 4455:5 4499:5 brings [2] 4407:2,16 broad [3] 4505:5 4561:6,11 broadcast [14] 4452:19 4529:20 4530:1,5 4534:12 4538:15,16,18 4539:3 4559:23 4560:11 4561:10 4584:5 4590:13 broadcaster [16] 4481:20 4534:13 4536:20,24 4537:2,3,6,9,20,23 **4538:**4 **4539:**4,6,9,17 **4597:**7 broadcaster's [2] 4537:11,21 broadcasters [5] 4419:3 4459:15 4481:23 4541:13 4552:13 broadcasting [1] 4510:16 broader [1] 4445:16 broadly [2] 4429:14 4560:18 BRYAN [1] 4401:7 Brynteson [2] 4488:4 4608:12 bucket [1] 4426:12 budget [2] 4415:23 4427:8 BUDRON [1] 4402:7 Building [3] 4400:14 4538:12,18 built [2] 4413:5 4547:21 bunch [2] 4545:13 4569:9 bundle [3] 4532:20 4537:25 4573: bundled [2] 4532:14 4534:19 bundles [9] 4531:10,11,13,14,16 4532:13,14 4533:5,12 bundling [2] 4532:15,19 Burdick [1] 4586:14 Burdock [1] 4542:16 Burling [1] 4402:17 business [4] 4413:14 4450:1 4532:16 4561:14 businesspeople [1] 4543:9 buy [7] 4511:20 4536:12 4538:3,20, 25 4598:22 4600:1 buyers [4] 4424:17 4536:8,11 4592:19

buying [5] 4424:18,19 4527:9 4542:1 4544:9

C's [2] 4488:3.11 CA [1] 4403:12 CABLE [72] 4400:6 4405:5 4414: 25 4417:16,18 4418:2,8,11,18,20, 25 4419:5,20 4420:15,16 4422:1,2 4423:1,12 4427:6,9 4428:4,9 4436:17 4439:8,17,24 4440:2 4446:1,25 4447:5 4449:22 4450:1, 11 4451:14,16 4452:5 4465:16 4474:15 4482:7,23 4483:1,3 4485: 24 4541:14 4544:3 4553:22 4560: 1,3 4**561**:12,13 **4573**:3,5 **4586**:6, 15 4587:1,6,9,10 4592:19,22 4597: 8 4599:17,24,25 4600:2,10 4601: 21 4602:2,7,15,21 calculate [1] 4579:9 calculated [7] 4415:17 4451:8,15 4461:19 4494:13 4518:1 4545:22 calculates [3] 4422:12 4498:3,8 calculating [3] 4445:14 4451:21 4517:6 calculations [2] 4579:15,17 call [3] 4426:16 4470:19 4520:10 called [4] 4444:5 4454:19 4460:10 4594:13 came [12] 4421:4.12 4427:7.22.23 4437:21 4450:6 4473:13 4556:12 4580:18 4590:23 4602:22 Canada [2] 4481:20,24 Canadian [21] 4403:2 4447:19,25 4470:6 4478:9,15,17,25 4479:16, 22 4480:15 4481:18,22 4483:6 4484:16 4485:2,14,23 4486:5 4518:17 4531:18 Canadian-only [1] 4407:1 Canadians [8] 4441:22 4460:21 4483:22 4484:4 4485:6,21 4486: 19 4577-25 cannot 5 4430:21 4461:9 4471: 16 4492:13 4600:3 CANTOR [2] 4401:5 4456:6 capacity [1] 4466:6 capture [1] 4468:6 captures [2] 4467:15 4477:24 capturing [1] 4477:20 care [2] 4486:8 4572:24 careful [2] 4452:23 4454:13 Carey [2] 4595:23,24 CARP [17] 4409:2 4418:5 4420:24 4421:6 4464:24 4479:4 4489:23 4552:18 4573:4 4574:1 4588:7,14 4597:14 4599:6,12,17 4600:3 CARPs [1] 4410:20 carriage [12] 4486:3 4534:6.7 4535:23,24 4546:9 4551:8,10,12 4569:8 4570:23 4582:16 carried [19] 4431:2 4437:1 4438:9

4447:24 4472:16,18,24,25 4473:3

4475:10,21,25 4482:3 4509:17

4531:6,7 4542:12 4554:13 4580: 22 carrier [1] 4418:5 carriers [1] 4542:13 carry [13] 4427:10 4436:25 4437:6 4445:23 4450:23 4474:7 4482:8 4485:24 4486:13 4536:23 4565: 15 4567:24 4580:17 carrying [6] 4436:23 4536:1 4559: 23 4563:1 4571:15 4579:5 carve [1] 4576:10 carved [1] 4569:3 carveout [1] 4569:16 carves [1] 4568:24 case [64] 4406:5 4410:10 4416:23 4418:7 4421:19,21 4430:10,16 4433:10 4439:5 4441:7,11 4442:3, 16 4444:9 4447:7 4448:7,24 4452: 3,25 4453:4,14,16 4457:2 4459:22 25 4460:6 4465:23 4479:8 4487: 10 4492:25 4493:21 4494:13,18, 19 4507:22.22 4508:11 4513:22 4514:15 4518:10 4528:21 4529: 16 4531:5,17 4538:13 4542:7 4552:17 4571:17,18 4573:1 4578: 1 4585:5 4588:4,5,5 4591:5,9 4592:6 4593:9,17 4594:21 4605:1, cases [9] 4410:11 4435:15 4453:4. 9 4459:14 4494:16 4495:1 4532:9 4571:22 categories [23] 4406:23 4424:14 4442:8 4447:15 4462:6 4476:4 4483:13 4484:9 4494:25 4508:16 **4531:**12 **4532:**3,14,25 **4545:**14 4557:5 4569:1 4583:12 4590:10 4591:19 4593:16,16 4600:11 categorization [1] 4588:9 category [21] 4406:22 4408:3 4435:5 4437:9 4438:15 4484:11 4493:7 4495:24 4497:23 4499:4 4544:21 4554:11 4555:5 4558:9, 19,23 4563:8 4569:1 4581:1,8 4593:18 causation [1] 4514:16 cause [2] 4503:13 4506:9 caused [3] 4455:1 4485:1 4505:12 CBC [1] 4481:19 CDC's [1] 4546:9 ceiling [1] 4479:9 cell [1] 4553:18 cells [3] 4548:21,22 4553:14 Central [1] 4566:14 centralized [1] 4474:12 Ceril [1] 4587:12 certain [10] 4474:7,8 4481:7 4491: 11 4493:25 4507:6,7 4529:7 4531: 14 4576:13 certainly [8] 4410:22 4418:14 4427:6 4453:11 4510:16 4512:7 4580:1 4605:15 certainty [1] 4488:14

CERTIFICATE [1] 4608:1 certify [1] 4608:3 cetera [1] 4507:8 challenged [1] 4429:17 challenges [2] 4554:21 4599:15 change [10] 4429:2 4450:9 4520: 25 4521:1,4,4,5,5,5 4601:17 changed [5] 4450:7 4474:17,19 4490:2 4491:14 changes [4] 4474:21,25 4475:11 4548:8 channel [3] 4534:19 4538:1 4544: channels [10] 4427:10,11 4531:17 4544:3 4580:16,19 4586:18,18 4604:18.19 characteristics [6] 4497:16 4504: 23 4507:24 4511:23 4515:18,20 characterize [3] 4507:16,18 4545: characterized [1] 4539:23 chart [6] 4422:23 4455:21 4457:9 4499:16.20 4589:23 cheaper [1] 4494:23 check [9] 4477:17 4511:6 4582:8,9 4603:21,21 4604:8,9,21 children [1] 4584:19 CHO [1] 4402:15 choice [4] 4447:3 4511:19.20 4568:20 choices [6] 4450:22 4507:1.2 4564:25 4567:19 4570:17 choose [7] 4485:24 4492:14 4493: 6 4508:25 4551:25 4566:15 4574: 15 chooses [1] 4579:1 choosing [3] 4499:8 4512:11 4576:11 chose [3] 4479:8.14.20 chosen [3] 4508:16,20,21 circle [1] 4600:15 Circuit [1] 4573:23 circumstance [2] 4473:6 4494:12 circumstances [6] 4479:22 4482: 9 4490:1.2 4491:15 4517:22 cite [2] 4539:25 4552:14 cited [4] 4485:7 4500:25 4593:9 4597:12 cites [1] 4589:21 citing [1] 4449:5 City [1] 4566:13 CityCenter [1] 4402:18 claim [3] 4512:19 4526:22 4604:4 claimant [3] 4471:12 4476:3 4575: Claimants [55] 4401:2,18 4402:13 4403:2,15 4404:2 4405:12,21,24 4406:22 4407:4,8,9,16 4423:7 4440:21,24 4443:22 4460:22 4461:12,13 4462:15 4464:5,8

4466:7 4470:6 4471:4,5 4478:9,

15,18 4479:22 4480:16 4484:23

4488:9 4516:12 4523:4 4526:13. 17,19 4535:8 4550:17 4555:11 4556:3.7 4557:21 4571:21 4576:4 4578;7 4582:25 4584:17 4586:2 4596:13 4604:4.12 Claimants' [6] 4407:6 4421:21 4423:6 4458:4,6 4575:11 claims [2] 4533:9,10 clarify [1] 4587:5 clarity [1] 4560:7 clear [11] 4409:3 4477:11 4502:14, 24 4551:7 4556:1 4561:2 4574:8 4594:11.16 4596:17 clearly [3] 4471:18 4558:16 4561: client [1] 4542:5 client's [1] 4452:14 clients [7] 4406:7 4413:16 4419:6, 20 4542:2 4546:20 4572:24 close [3] 4407:17 4440:10 4468:3 closely [1] 4422:9 closer [2] 4438:21 4577:15 Closing [15] 4405:4,10,21 4406:6 4440:21 4464:5 4478:15 4482:22 4486:18 4488:9 4525:15,23 4584: 2 4589:13 4607:2 co-counsel [1] 4406:2 coefficient [32] 4494:7 4495:7 4496:12,12 4497:6,22,24 4498:1 4499:5 4500:8 4501:14,15 4502: 16 4503:13 4505:3 4507:11 4510: 1,3,5,10,23 4511:2,18,24 4515:8, 24 4516:14,18 4518:7,13,15 4563: coefficients [15] 4465:11 4491:21, 23 4492:23 4494:4 4495:23 4498: 10,13 4503:24 4504:3,6,12,18,20 4505:5 coin [2] 4463:2 4476:24 collapse [1] 4482:20 collapsing [1] 4483:20 colleagues [1] 4421:24 collection [1] 4547:14 college [1] 4435:23 column [3] 4474:2 4494:11 4574: combine [1] 4553:13 come [16] 4408:16 4432:22 4436: 21 4439:21 4440:10 4449:5 4464: 25 4476:13 4479:12 4489:10 4504:2 4524:7 4532:20 4534:23 4569:9 4602:2 comes [8] 4411:4 4414:24 4419: 11 4422:17 4425:4 4426:13 4468: 3 4514:21 coming [4] 4514:5 4525:4 4571:12 4597:1 comment [1] 4448:16 commented [1] 4538:9 comments [2] 4439:13 4443:16 Commercial [25] 4401:18 4407:7

21.23 4458:3 4466:6 4470:3,21 4471:3 4476:8 4478:24 4482:1 4483:9.10.14 4484:15 4526:23 4544:8 4586:2 4595:15.18 committee [2] 4587:20,22 common [2] 4489:16 4564:4 commonly [1] 4422:6 communities [4] 4445:15 4446:1 4449:21 4495:13 community [2] 4450:2,2 community-by-community [1] 4451:23 company [1] 4413:13 comparable [2] 4448:14 4458:6 compare [2] 4508:20 4554:17 compared [4] 4423:1 4514:13 4533:20 4581:24 compares [3] 4427:21.23 4451:9 comparing [1] 4564:5 comparison [4] 4462:7,9 4550:19 4554:19 comparisons [3] 4550:12,16 4561:8 compensable [20] 4431:6,7,21 4432:1.11.12 4461:24 4462:10.14 4466:25 4472:21 4473:5 4475:11 4550:13,21 4551:4,17 4553:9 4580:25 4582:18 compensate [2] 4532:13 4533:2 compensated [3] 4532:11 4534: 25 4535:4 compensating [1] 4535:10 compensation [5] 4530:21 4531: 3,21 4535:9 4539:15 competing [3] 4440:1 4480:5 4528:17 complained [1] 4446:13 complaining [1] 4460:2 complement [1] 4513:24 complete [3] 4504:17 4538:4 4553:5 completed [3] 4564:11,17,18 completely [9] 4453:23 4456:8 4461:11 4484:10 4503:18 4535:8 4555:9.9 4601:1 complex [6] 4471:1 4474:5 4482: 24 4484:4 4562:23 4563:12 complexity [2] 4484:25 4485:8 complicated [3] 4475:22 4484:21 4490:19 complication [1] 4485:1 component [2] 4481:5 4544:19 comprehensive [5] 4442:7 4452: 2 4467:22 4474:1 4480:21 comprising [1] 4599:20 compulsion [2] 4536:12,13 compulsory [6] 4411:1 4416:2 **4419:**17 **4527:**11 **4528:**6 **4551:**15 concept 3 4513:6 4525:20 4559: conceptual [1] 4413:2 conceptually [1] 4465:13

concern [1] 4410:18 concerned [4] 4428:8 4468:17 4493:22 4556:2 concerns [4] 4444:2,23 4445:2 4550:2 conclude [1] 4572:16 concluded [1] 4421:15 concludes [1] 4558:8 concluding [1] 4597:21 conclusion [5] 4412:9 4511:13 4522:17 4563:25 4600:9 Conclusions [4] 4466:10 4490:4 **4562:8 4590:**5 conditions [5] 4419:15 4558:1,6, 10.11 conduct [2] 4565:11 4566:7 conducted [1] 4465:13 conference [1] 4606:4 confidence [5] 4465:10 4468:12 4476:7 4488:14 4599:2 confirmed [1] 4594:20 confirms [1] 4455:17 confounding [1] 4558:13 confused [2] 4559:14 4568:17 confusing [1] 4537:5 Congress [6] 4400:2,13 4410:14 4539:24 4587:22 4599:10 connected [1] 4599:4 connection [1] 4552:9 Conrad [1] 4484:6 consequence [1] 4597:22 conservative [1] 4470:11 consider [9] 4414:16 4460:3 4461: 6 4517:6,12 4518:2 4527:22 4540: 24 4573:19 consideration [4] 4481:4 4486:21 4560:5 4600:7 considerations [3] 4429:23 4430: considered 9 4411:8,10 4461:10 **4522**:9 **4526**:24 **4529**:21,23 **4534**: 21 4559:4 consist [1] 4536:18 consistency [7] 4410:18,19,24 4411:12.16 4488:14 4556:15 consistent [4] 4448:24 4449:6 4502:20 4547:14 consistently [1] 4488:15 consolidation [1] 4451:19 constant [5] 4432:4 4448:1 4474: 19 4482:17 4593:15 constitute [5] 4408:19 4409:4 4527:20 4559:8 4581:6 constituted [2] 4415:25 4580:25 constitutes [4] 4553:18,19 4570: 23 4600:18 constituting [1] 4408:20 construct [6] 4541:4 4546:25 4555:21 4562:14,20 4599:18 consulting [1] 4544:15 consumed [3] 4541:1 4573:1 **4586:**8

consumes [1] 4574:4 contains [1] 4529:20 contemplate [1] 4557:16 contemplated [1] 4527:8 contend [1] 4553:6 content [9] 4423:14.16.17 4455:14 4508:4.8 4540:25.25 4572:25 contents [1] 4455:7 context [10] 4425:14 4429:16 4453:19 4540:20 4543:6 4550:19 4582:5,12 4590:5 4593:1 continue [5] 4439:14 4482:7 4536: 1 4572:17 4584:17 Continued [4] 4402:1 4403:1 4404:1 4589:13 contours [1] 4467:3 contradicted [2] 4473:9 4476:4 contradictory [1] 4486:11 contradicts [1] 4414:18 contrary [2] 4409:23 4599:6 contribute [2] 4542:14 4547:18 contribution [1] 4591:17 contributions [1] 4455:2 control @ 4468:8 4492:19 4519: 16.20.23 4605:1 controlled [2] 4468:8 4518:3 controls [4] 4518:22,23 4521:13 4590.7 controverted [3] 4416:20 4417:1 4427:20 convenience [1] 4532:19 convenient [2] 4532:9,24 conversation [1] 4439:18 COPYRIGHT [48] 4400:1 4410:16, 23 4412:3 4417:25 4418:24 4419: 1 4479:6 4489:3 4527:1 4529:6.7. 8,25 4530:4,9,12,13,18,21 4531:4 4533:2.3 4534:9.11.20.21.22.24 4535:3,6,10,19 4536:21 4537:1,2, 7,24 4538:14,21 4539:19 4540:5,9, 13,16,24 4597:8,12 correct [24] 4407:14,15 4424:6 4470:16,21 4473:12,19 4491:25 **4502**:10,13 **4505**:25 **4506**:3 **4516**: 24 4532:7 4538:7 4567:15 4570: 15,16,25 4571:10 4587:9 4588:9 4589:21 4590:21 corrected [3] 4471:15 4473:16 4579:16 correcting [1] 4471:1 correctly [6] 4425:13 4504:18 4510:24 4518:1 4519:16 4578:23 correlated [1] 4504:22 correlation [18] 4491:19 4492:17, 20 4501:15 4502:17 4504:12,24 4507:10 4509:23 4512:20 4514: 15,24 4515:10 4516:11 4518:7 4544:12 4563:23 4603:19 correlations [1] 4516:5 corroborate [4] 4520:20 4581:20 4589:10 4604:2 corroborated [3] 4444:19 4446:

4421:20 4435:16 4437:2 4440:15,

22 4492:6 corroborating [1] 4491:9 corroboration [2] 4439:15 4477: 17 corroborative [3] 4448:18,22 4521-18 COSENTINO [2] 4403:9 4552:22 cost [11] 4474:18 4480:22 4494:11. 12.12.24 4495:2 4510:11.23 4511: 1 4566:14 costs [3] 4510:15 4512:9 4530:7 couldn't [1] 4595:7 Council [1] 4587:21 COUNSEL [4] 4525:23 4581:10 4583:15.18 count [1] 4520:15 country [9] 4479:25 4480:6,9 4481:4,6,15 4489:15 4579:11 4604:17 couple [6] 4417:11 4515:2 4555: 14 4575:17 4580:4 4582:14 course [8] 4414:6.23 4430:14 4491:1 4492:4 4526:2 4577:6 4596:24 Court [10] 4421:5 4429:20 4488:4. 7 4523:23 4524:6 4588:4,13 4608: 10 13 courtesies [1] 4585:5 cover [2] 4460:1 4535:20 covering [1] 4442:7 covers [1] 4526:14 Covington [1] 4402:17 Crawford [66] 4407:7 4421:22 4423:11 4426:22 4427:21 4428: 22 4430:8 4439:16 4441:13 4444: 14 4447:7 4448:25 4450:3.15.18 4462:25 4463:6 4465:24 4466:12 **4467**:11,20,21 **4468**:4,15,23 **4471**: 5 4473:23 4476:5.7 4477:23 4480: 20 4481:2 4482:10 4498:9,12 4499:20 4500:5 4501:7,13 4502:5 **4503**:5,6 **4506**:16 **4509**:6,13 **4516**: 22 4517:4 4518:22,25 4521:9,24 4522:3 4529:1 4535:15 4536:15 4571:18 4577:1 4578:14 4579:16 4580:1 4589:14 4591:7,20 4592:4 4593:5 4594:10 Crawford's [44] 4446:17 4450:4 4451:2 4462:9.20 4464:20 4465: 20 4466:4.7.20 4467:14 4468:11. 8,9 4486:20,25 4498:16 4500:15 4501:4 4502:21 4504:2,4 4506:7 **4509:**5 **4516:**3 **4517:**23 **4519:**18

18 4469:6,13,22 4480:17,18 4481: 4520:7 4564:22 4570:16 4579:14 4581:22 4582:3 4583:24 4584:25 4586:24 4589:5 4594:17 CRC [1] 4400:23 create [1] 4540:25 created [3] 4410:15 4538:23 4572: 18

creating [4] 4410:22 4538:18

4554:10 4587:15 creation [1] 4435:4 creative [1] 4543:8 creators [1] 4540:25 credit [1] 4562:10 critical [7] 4425:23 4534:1 4535:2 4545:2 4557:1 4565:3 4598:13 criticism [11] 4449:7.13 4451:12 4500:21 4548:18.20 4549:22 4553:4 4554:5 4591:22 4598:20 criticisms [9] 4444:1 4446:8 4449: 4 4546:11 4555:10 4578:10 4579: 20 4598:3,20 critics [1] 4546:17 CRJs [4] 4444:15,17,23 4446:20 cross-examination [7] 4455:20 4456:6 4501:6 4544:14 4556:13 4557:12 4559:14 cross-examine [1] 4603:12 cross-examined [4] 4501:5 4551: 9 4595:3 4596:18 cross-examining [1] 4585:17 Crowell [1] 4401:22 CRR [1] 4400:23 CRT [1] 4573:25 CRTC [1] 4546:10 Cs [1] 4488:14 CSO [30] 4444:21 4530:2,14,16 4531:7 4534:6,10,18,20 4537:8,19 4538:3,11,11,12,17,20,25 4539:3, 10,20 4542:10 4544:19 4558:4 **4562**:25 **4563**:2,4,6 **4565**:11 **4573**: CSOs [25] 4445:12,23 4530:9 4534: 8 4535:21 4539:10 4540:11 4541: 14 4558:2 4563:18 4564:3.6.25 4565:6.12.15.21 4566:18.23.24 4567:22 4571:12 4574:10,16 4580:17 CSOs' [1] 4529:19 CTV [15] 4443:3 4445:1 4463:11. 14 4503:8,9,10 4518:17 4519:15, 19 4520:3 4521:13,15 4542:16 4590:23 CTV's [1] 4503:13 cull [1] 4542:4 currency [2] 4452:12 4541:12 current [5] 4534:4 4535:11,25,25 4536.2 custom [5] 4454:15.21 4541:10 4542:7 4546:20 customizing [1] 4554:12 cutting [1] 4576:12

D.C [10] 4400:16 4401:10.16.24 4402:10,20 4403:6,20 4404:8 4573:23 **DANIEL [1] 4401:5** darker [1] 4514:14 data [93] 4408:5 4409:4,19 4413: 22 4414:12,17 4416:17,17,20 4417:1 4427:16 4430:7,19,25

4431:24 4433:16.18 4434:5.6.10. 11,12 4439:17 4445:22 4446:3,25 4448:10.19 4450:16 4453:21 4454:8,16 4456:10,25,25 4457:8, 12,23 4458:7,16 4459:1,2 4460:11, 12 4466:18 4467:21,25 4468:5 4469:1.3 4470:16 4471:1 4473:21. 25 4476:18,21 4544:16 4546:8,8,9, 10.12.14 4547:14.19 4548:9.10.18. 19 **4549**:3.10,12,20,23,25 **4550**:1. 2,4,6,7,10,10 4552:6,19 4553:1,4, 5.15.18.19.19 **4583:**13 **4588:**20 database 191 4432:22,24 4542:4 4546:15 4547:1,11,20 4548:1,2 databases [2] 4542:5,7 dataset [3] 4467:23 4474:1 4477:8 date [4] 4405:4 4606:3 4608:10,13 DAVID [2] 4400:11 4401:20 day [9] 4412:16 4426:8 4459:12 4464:25 4492:17 4546:2 4553:24 4562:23 4605:24 davs [2] 4553:24.25 de [3] 4409:25 4410:8 4543:18 dead [1] 4572:20 deadline [1] 4606:2 deal [6] 4419:2.3 4435:7 4477:2.3 4605:4 dealing [3] 4418:25 4482:15 4485: 21 dealt [1] 4605:5 debate [1] 4419:8 decades [5] 4412:8 4413:14 4458: 23 4527:18 4598:23 decide [4] 4409 13 4444 6 4445: 25 4507:3 decided [2] 4580:17 4598:25 decidina [3] 4441:3 4451:22 4593: decision [14] 4411:5 4429:15.22. 22 4440:7 4444:14,17 4445:5 4446:20 4461:10 4465:16 4489: 20 4567:6 4601:17 decision-makers গ্রে 4552:5,25 4562:11 decision-making [1] 4584:9 decisions [18] 4410:9 4428:13,14 4429:9 4439:22 4441:12,17 4442: 16 4443:11 4444:11 4445:13 4474:11 4488:25 4557:10 4560:2. 3 4565:20 4600:13 decisis [1] 4489:1 decline [1] 4551:4 declining [1] 4544:13 decreased [1] 4582:16 deem [1] 4569:19 deep [1] 4405:24 defective [1] 4453:17 defense [1] 4430:22

4554:12 definitions [1] 4529:17 degree [1] 4586:23 degrees [1] 4520:10 delivered [1] 4433:7 demand [10] 4486:5 4559:7 4597: 24,25 4598:8,17,25 4601:21 4602: demand-side [1] 4559:5 demonstrably [1] 4475:4 demonstrate [1] 4494:9 demonstrated [1] 4559:3 demonstrative [3] 4500:22 4501: 20 4502:2 depart [1] 4430:10 departing [1] 4408:9 departure [2] 4601:19,20 dependent [3] 4485:13 4506:17 4519:1 depending [3] 4506:1,6 4520:15 depends [1] 4492:19 depict [1] 4505:6 depiction [1] 4502:11 depress [1] 4432:14 describe [2] 4457:12 4599:17 described [3] 4509:16 4542:2 4588:24 describing [1] 4455:14 description [2] 4598:10.11 deserved [1] 4562:13 design [1] 4447:22 designated [1] 4602:20 designed [1] 4546:15 despite [1] 4472:16 detail [6] 4430:13 4443:7 4472:3 4475:7 4588:25 4599:18 details [4] 4406:15 4434:25 4593: 19 4597:18 detectable [1] 4523:1 DETERMINATION [5] 4400:6 4594:2 4600:20 4601:2 4606:1 determinations [17] 4408:16,24 4409:9 4410:6 4411:14 4441:25 4449:23 4452:6 4488:21 4489:4, 11,18,24,25 4490:5 4552:7 4555: 24 determine [16] 4409:10 4442:15 4466:24 4527:20 4535:17 4542:3 4544:16 4554:23 4565:10 4575:4. 5.6 4583;4 4591;15.16 4597;25 determined [15] 4410:3 4424:22 4442:19 4447:23 4453:9 4539:7.8 4540:4 4558:20,23,24 4563:20,21 4564:5 4601:9 determines 2 4600:11 4601:22 determining [10] 4463:2 4466:1,9 4479:15 4540:8 4542:18 4544:19 4552:8 4573:19 4599:18 develop 🔯 4479:20 🕟 developed 5 4413:16 4416:18 4442:12 4480:1,13 developing [1] 4492:4

define [1] 4499:10

4506:15

definitely [3] 4409:15 4486:4

definition [3] 4415:14 4526:25

devil [1] 4406:14 Devotional [21] 4403:15 4404:2 4443:6 4448:5 4460:22 4461:12 4462:14 4475:16 4488:9 4494:22 4495:5 4507:7 4510:18 4512:23 4513:1.4.25 4516:12 4523:4 4576: Devotionals [8] 4441:22 4461:25 4470:4 4483:15 4487:4,12 4522: 23 4581:5 difference [18] 4423:11 4435:20 4436:20 4448:4 4450:25,25 4457: 11.19 4462:13 4463:11 4495:2 4506:12,13 4518:22 4519:12 4523:1 4567:25 4570:14 differences [5] 4446:11 4452:20 4458:20 4583:11 4601:16 different [66] 4410:10 4411:6 4422:7.17 4424:13 4429:19.23 4430:3,4,5,5 4433:20 4438:18 4445:19 4448:10,10,12 4449:21 4450:6 4452:1 4457:18 4459:2 4460:24 4476:24 4478:23 4481:5, 13 4482:18 4483:2,23 4484:10 4489:9 4496:17 4505:19,20 4506: 5 4508:16 4511:23 4512:15 4513: 10 4520:15 4521:25 4526:1 4527: 15,19 4530:25 4541:15 4546:4 4551:11 4555:18 4558:10 4561: 14 4562:7,8,25,25 4563:1,23 4577: 6,20 4579:8 4583:8 4584:11 4592: 16 4600:11 4601:2 difficult [2] 4562:16 4566:6 difficulties [1] 4413:3 digress [1] 4422:4 **DIMA** [1] 4402:7 direct [5] 4416:23 4486:4 4538:14, 20 4574:6 direction [4] 4471:22 4491:10 4522:21 4523:14 directly [10] 4414:18 4418:25 4465:3,5 4488:17 4528:11 4530: 23 4539:1 4591:14 4599:5 DirecTV [1] 4440:1 disadvantage [1] 4525:11 disagree [5] 4414:1 4482:13 4555: 21 4597:9 4600:6 disappoint [1] 4478:18 discarded [2] 4472:9 4473:12 discern [1] 4566:6 disclaimed [1] 4590:25 discuss [9] 4441:9,14,20 4472:2 4528:15,18,20,22,25 discussed [5] 4477:13 4513:14 4516:8 4555:23 4603:16 discussion [4] 4529:5 4598:2 4599:11.20 disingenuous [1] 4573:5 dismisses [1] 4417:9 Disney [1] 4526:18 disproportionately [1] 4494:1 dispute [2] 4411:2 4464:13

distance [1] 4438:4 distant [64] 4415:5 4417:4 4424:4 4427:18 4428:6 4431:2,4 4436:13, 16 4437:2 4438:10 4445:10,13,22. 24.25 4447:4 4449:11,20,20 4450: 23 4451:4,5,22 4455:24 4459:11 4467:1.25 4472:19 4474:8 4496: 21 4504:5 4507:4 4516:17 4518:3 4529:19 4530:2 4531:20 4535:21, 24 4537:10.20 4542:11,13 4545: 23 4546:1 4548:25 4549:7,9,23 4550:19,20,21 4553:22 4556:22 4560:6 4561:6,10 4573:2,21 4574: 7 4577:9 4582:15 4604:14 distantly [9] 4426:25 4507:4 4510: 17 4527:10 4530:19 4536:5 4543: 16 4580:18 4587:7 distinction [2] 4494:24 4525:13 distinctive [1] 4580:19 distinguishing [1] 4566:22 distributed [3] 4432:24 4433:12, 13 distributing [1] 4419:14 Distribution [10] 4405:5 4428:24 4459:23 4532:6 4544:24,25 4573: 16 4575:11 4599:17.24 divide [1] 4479:1 dividing [1] 4516:18 dog [1] 4421:15 doing [10] 4413:14 4437:11 4451: 13 4508:14 4519:21 4521:4 4566: 18 4571:6 4591:7 4602:8 dominant [1] 4436:7 dominate [1] 4538:24 **DOMINIQUE** [1] 4402:5 done [18] 4407:8 4418:16 4421:7 4423:24 4425:11 4428:24 4433:9 4436:9 4439:22 4452:16 4459:4 4463:4 4465:21 4482:17 4554:9 4564:16 4586:13 4606:1 doubt [1] 4486:6 DOVE [20] 4402:14 4463:24 4464: 2,6,7 4478:6,7 4480:19 4540:22 4578:5,8 4581:18 4582:9,14 4583: 18 4585:7 4592:3 4594:7 4607:5, down [13] 4426:11 4432:2,11,13 4442:4 4460:19 4463:17 4481:21 4494:15 4495:8 4499:5 4503:14 4596:4 downward [1] 4495:7 drama [1] 4584:19 dramatic [2] 4475:10 4551:4 draw [3] 4424:7 4425:2 4560:20 drawing [3] 4502:4,5 4559:16 driving [2] 4436:12,19 drop [1] 4503:8 dropped [1] 4577:10 dropping [2] 4576:8,25 drops [1] 4577:3 Drs [3] 4529:1 4535:15 4536:15 DSE [5] 4494:16 4568:6,19 4569:

0. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010 11 4571:2 DSEs (1) 4494:16 dual (2) 4536:21 4537:6 Ducey (1) 4427:23 due (2) 4485:8 4492:2 duplicative (1) 4594:19 during (12) 4412:15 4414:23 4416: 4 4417:3 4431:17 4447:5 4448:17 4482:21 4508:11 4516:9 4551:1 4596:24 DUSTIN (1) 4402:15 dwell (1) 4420:11 E each (31) 4406:20 4411:3 4438:15 4444:22 4457:20 4460:24 4463:8

4469:9 4470:13 4473:23 4475:15 4495:6 4527:22 4532:4,20,20 4538:4 4544:20 4545:7,7,9,21 4550:8 4553:21,23,25 4563:2,7 4589:17,19 4598:1 earlier [7] 4429:22 4489:8 4518:21 4522:4 4540:22 4583:10 4603:17 early [2] 4524:4 4595:24 easier [2] 4475:22,23 echo [1] 4452:7 econometric [3] 4443:19 4450:24 4491:25 econometricians [1] 4553:17 economic [11] 4443:12 4447:3 4449:23 4450:22 4493:1 4513:2 4564:25 4567:19 4570:6 4599:20 4600:4 economist [2] 4414:9 4423:22 economists [2] 4413:25 4538:8 edited [2] 4469:2.3 effect [12] 4446:10 4526:6 4543:20 4550:23 4562:2.4.7 4576:14 4588: 22 4590:8 4602:20 4603:3 effective [1] 4468:8 effectively [2] 4577:1,3 effects [4] 4513:23 4577:2 4589:8 4590:15 efficiencies [1] 4538:22 effort [1] 4480:22 efforts [2] 4435:7 4480:18 eight [1] 4524:13 either 9 4421:15 4427:20 4434:6 4474:12 4497:2 4499:24 4500:1 4512:9 4593:23 elaborate [1] 4406:11 elements [2] 4534:1 4535:12 elicited [1] 4556:18 eliminate [1] 4589:5 eliminating [1] 4569:11 elimination [1] 4446:11 else's [1] 4486:2 embed [1] 4531:6 embedded [2] 4530:18 4531:19 emphasize [2] 4413:19 4416:19 emphatic [1] 4547:22

empirical [7] 4408:1,4 4409:19

4413:22 4414:13,17 4416:17

emplovs [1] 4545:18 enacted [1] 4530:6 encapsulates [1] 4528:12 end [11] 4406:5,6 4440:5 4492:16 4497:5 4514:12 4576:1 4584:22 4586:5 4588:8 4602:1 endeavor [1] 4531:24 ended [2] 4549:15 4564:12 enhance [1] 4450:1 enhancing [1] 4554:11 enjoy [2] 4529:17 4604:12 enjoying [1] 4604:18 enlarged [1] 4510:14 enough [3] 4460:1 4515:19 4527: ensure [2] 4535:19 4587:23 ensurina [1] 4559:20 entire [6] 4466:18 4468:1 4518:16 4521:19 4539:11 4579:10 entirely [12] 4447:8 4448:9,10,10 4450:10 4456:24 4485:12 4539: 22 4540:1 4552:23 4584:10 4589: entities [1] 4541:15 entitled [3] 4489:1 4531:20 4575: envelope [1] 4454:23 envious [1] 4480:23 envisage [1] 4597:24 equal [9] 4420:17,25 4421:3 4425: 24 4492:18,19,21 4496:2 4588:8 equally [3] 4456:22 4495:25 4567: equals [6] 4408:2 4409:20,21 4413:21 4414:14 4425:5 equate [5] 4408:7 4420:6 4428:19 4493:18.19 equates [2] 4424:23 4477:13 equivalents [1] 4424:4 Erdem [14] 4449:8 4501:24 4502:1, 23 4503:2 4509:19,21 4515:7 4522:1,24 4536:16 4544:22 4590: 24 4591:7 Erdem's [4] 4502:20 4503:18 4509:3 4590:24 Errata [2] 4455:8,14 error [1] 4506:1 errors [3] 4456:19 4588:10,23 ERVIN [1] 4401:20 Ervin's [2] 4500:24 4501:3 especially [1] 4552:7 ESPN [1] 4561:11 espoused [1] 4429:10 ESQ [24] 4401:3,4,5,6,7,13,19,20, 21 4402:3,4,5,6,7,14,15,16 4403:3, 9,16,17 4404:3,4,5 essentially [6] 4418:9 4450:19 4451:4 4463:2 4478:22 4516:20 established [4] 4408:11 4418:5 4522:24 4601:5 estimated [1] 4581:4

estimates [6] 4432:23 4446:15

4454:6,14 4456:8 4476:10 et [1] 4507:8 evaluate 2 4527:19 4528:17 evaluated [2] 4444:25 4479:13 evaluating [2] 4442:13 4530:25 evaluation [1] 4442:5 Even [50] 4414:2 4419:7 4425:17 4434:4 4454:23 4456:14,24 4458: 20 4460:3 4468:2,8,10 4474:12 4484:22 4486:12 4498:17.21 4499:5 4510:3,24 4511:14 4520: 14 4543:13 4547:10 4548:16 4553:3 4554:20 4557:14 4558:21 **4559**:11.14 **4561**:2 **4565**:2.6.20 4566:16 4567:10 4568:9 4569:12. 25.25 4578:18 4583:4.20 4591:4.6 4592:11 4598:5 4603:23 4604:4 event [4] 4455:16 4574:14 4584:7 4603:10 events [1] 4551:11 Everybody [12] 4413:8 4418:23 4430:20 4432:16 4484:12 4496:2, 13 4498:19 4501:15 4502:15 4516:6 4586:6 Everyone 3 4474:10 4567:20 4605:22 everything [3] 4468:24 4519:9 4596:23 evidence [72] 4408:1,4 4409:14, 19,22,25 4412:5,11,11,19,22 4413: 22 4414:13.17 4420:21 4424:15 4425:6 4436:4 4439:3 4441:1.6. 14 4442:6,6,14 4443:10 4444:8,11, 16 **4445**:4 **4449**:1 **4450**:21 **4452**:3 4453:4.16 4458:12 4459:3 4462:4. 24 4464:18 4468:23 4486:3 4 4490:3 4527:21 4528:3,4,8,19,20, 21,23,24,24 4529:3 4552:10 4555: 17 4557:11 4559:3,9 4572:22 4573:15,15 4574:6 4580:9,12 4586:22,25 4600:24 4602:14,17 4603:8 evidentiary [1] 4501:19 evolution [2] 4411:21 4522:11 evolved [1] 4429:13 exact [1] 4516:16 exactly [13] 4420:8 4421:10 4422: 21 4428:16 4429:20 4432:18 4443:24 4496:7.10 4500:18 4503: 6 4511:10 4515:6 examine [1] 4523:13 example [21] 4434:9 4437:13,15 4449:15 4466:6 4469:17 4494:19, 21,22 4495:3 4503:7,14,24 4504:1 4505:20 4510:18 4517:21 4521: 11 4531:18 4557:18 4568:12 examples [10] 4435:4 4437:20,20, 23 4438:13 4467:7 4554:12 4586: 9 4593:20 4594:22 excellence [1] 4587:20 except [3] 4436:25 4481:22 4494:

exception 3 4480:11 4545:9 4571:21 exchange [2] 4559:18 4561:1 exclude [1] 4555:6 excluded [2] 4456:5 4477:8 excludes [1] 4567:11 exclusive [4] 4529:7.10 4530:12 4531-10 Excuse [2] 4505:5 4550:12 executive [1] 4439:25 exempt [1] 4435:14 exercise [1] 4563:13 exercises [1] 4563:17 Exhibit [7] 4431:24 4461:20 4462: 4.8.12 4586:23 4599:12 exist [4] 4480:5 4536:2.3 4600:2 existed [2] 4557:24 4583:6 existing [1] 4542:4 exists [2] 4409:25 4564:24 expect [2] 4549:3 4551:19 expectations [1] 4520:24 expected [5] 4454:19 4455:2,22 4457:15 4549:8 expecting [2] 4521:2,6 experience [10] 4439:20 4474:18 4546:19 4559:15 4560:20,21,25 4561:7,11 4585:17 expert [5] 4464:10 4499:21 4501: 10 4510:2 4541:8 expert's [1] 4501:9 expertise [1] 4541:9 experts [4] 4433:23 4467:10 4510: 8 4580:1 explain [7] 4491:21 4493:2 4500: 18 4503:4.6 4506:15 4512:20 explained [6] 4489:22 4500:14 4502:9 4503:3.18 4589:20 explaining [3] 4452:19 4503:7 explanation [4] 4433:22 4511:2,4 4562:16 explanatory [1] 4501:20 exploitation [6] 4530:21 4531:3 4534:22 4535:1,21 4540:5 expressed [2] 4504:3 4556:11 extend [1] 4533:9 extensive [1] 4562:15 extent [15] 4477:19 4527:3 4538: 23 4540:11 4550:9 4554:5,24 4555:1,4 4564:24 4565:6,16 4567: 17 4569:18 4592:14 extra [1] 4568:19 extract [1] 4592:20 extremely [2] 4426:14 4480:17 extrinsic [1] 4592:22

F.3d [2] 4552:13 4588:5

fact [59] 4409:1,10 4410:6 4414:8,

12 4428:1 4429:5 4434:9 4435:5.

8.12 4436:4 4449:9.16 4454:4.5

face [1] 4581:3

faced [1] 4479:11

4456:5 4457:8 4463:14 4472:17 4481:12 4482:12 4486:10 4489: 14 4496:13 4501:6 4517:9 4518:2 4519:1 4531:22,25 4532:10 4535: 6 4539:23 4540:24 4545:17 4548: 24 4549:4 4556:19 4566:20.25 4570:19 4573:8,24 4586:21,25 4588:17 4592:18 4594:10.18.18. 19 4597:21 4600:19,22 4601:8,15, 24 4605:5 factor [5] 4480:14 4505:13.14 4560:4 4566:23 factors [6] 4465:15 4468:9 4505: 12 4506:8 4592:21 4599:20 facts [2] 4411:4 4536:14 factual [3] 4408:16.18 4601:6 failed [2] 4518:25 4588:9 fails [1] 4556:21 Failure [5] 4434\8 4472:15 4555:5 4556:9 4574:12 fair [8] 4431:13 4455:8 4499:12,13 4560:22,23 4570:13,19 fairest [1] 4486:24 fairly [1] 4485:22 faith [3] 4520:21,21,22 fall [4] 4476:19 4529:16 4583:12 4593:8 fallacious [1] 4460:12 falling [1] 4533:13 falls [1] 4426:12 false [1] 4450:7 familiar [3] 4520:5 4548:7 4552:21 fantastic [1] 4482:11 far [8] 4420:19 4465:22 4467:7 4468:24 4474:5 4533:19 4547:12 4556-1 farther [1] 4454:23 fashion [2] 4410:4 4597:16 faults [2] 4523:6,7 favor [5] 4411:12 4458:21 4459:5 4522:23 4589:1 favorably [1] 4429:6 favored [2] 4558:24 4589:2 favorite [1] 4411:11 favors [2] 4571:19.20 feature [1] 4447:22 February [1] 4584:61 fed [1] 4437\23 1 FEDER [4] 4400:10 4547:2 4602: 23 4603:1 Federal [2] 4489:21 4592:9 fee [47] 4418:10 4449:10,18 4450:5, 17,22 4451:21 4478:21 4486:15 **4492:**13,21,24 **4493**:18 **4494**:20 4497:4,8 4498:25 4503:7 4508:7, 24 4512:10 4519:3,22 4534:14 4565:14,21 4566:5,23,25 4567:5, 20 4568:7 4569:5,16 4570:1,10 **4571:**3 **4576:**8,11,17,25 **4579:**12 **4588**:11 **4589**:6,24 **4604**:25 **4605**: fee-based [4] 4490:14 4491:16

4492:9 4528:25 fee-generated [1] 4451:11 fee-paying [1] 4578:25 feel [2] 4434:22 4526:8 feels [1] 4434:19 fees [24] 4422:2 4423:15.16 4450: 12 4451:22 4491:19 4502:17 4504:12 4513:12.18 4514:9 4530: 20 4531:2 4534:8 4536:4 4551:13. 14 4565:5,9 4568:24 4574:10 4576:23 4587:2 4605:2 fees-based [2] 4567:17 4574:9 fell [3] 4411:11 4472:22 4582:19 felt [1] 4410:20 few [11] 4467:13 4469:12 4476:12 4489:14 4492:11 4534:23 4535: 16 4556:18 4573:11 4578:9 4586: fewer [3] 4498:24 4499:2 4585:13 fight [1] 4479:4 Figure [14] 4457:10 4470:15 4493: 24 4508:17,23 4509:8 4533:1 4534:24 4542:3 4543:9 4557:6 Figures [1] 4462:12 figuring [1] 4598:16 filing [1] 4454:22 fill [2] 4416:1 4544:20 final 5 4522:12 4523:8 4575:11 4594:13 4604:23 finally [10] 4420:23 4441:23 4461: 15 4475:2 4476:2 4491:13 4518: 19 4528:25 4584:2 4592:2 financial [1] 4536:11 find [18] 4450:8 4500:12.23 4501: 19 4507:2,5 4515:9,11 4516:10,10 4520:13 4526:16.18 4528:10 4552:11,20 4592:10 4604:3 Finding [3] 4454:5 4599:9 4601:6 findings [19] 4408:17,18 4450:9 4454:4 4455:11 4461:17 4463:16 4469:9 4472:3,4 4475:7 4517:9 4540:1 4557:21 4579:23,24,25 4598:13 4600:19 finds [1] 4439:15 fine [2] 4406:8 4525:21 first [42] 4411:23 4412:10 4415:3 4417:11 4429:6 4440:24 4441:5 4442:14 4445:9 4450:21 4453:20 4454:4 4456:2 4467:20 4469:13 4472:5 4473:17 4483:11 4490:1. 13 4491:18 4495:19 4516:7 4525: 15 4536:21 4546:13 4549:11 4552:24 4559:24 4560:14 4563: 17 **4571:**2 **4576:**11 **4578:**11 **4584:** 5 4586:3 5 4590:24 4591:4 4597: 11 4599:17.19 fit [2] 4415:13 4534:2 fits [1] 4528:22 five [5] 4406:19 4527:15 4532:25 4595:8 4596:1 fixed [5] 4455; 12 4513;23 4577;2

25

4589:8 4590:15

fixed-effects [2] 4446:5.6 fixes [1] 4473:23 flat [2] 4498:17,18 flatly [1] 4559:1 flawed [3] 4461:9 4485:18 4574:9 flaws [5] 4407:14.16 4471:22 4529: 2 4557:1 flip [1] 4427:15 Floor [2] 4402:9 4479:10 flowing [2] 4514:2.4 focus [4] 4420:16 4480:12 4490: 13 4554:13 focused [6] 4413:11 4417:15 4448: 11 4479:21 4483:12,19 focuses [1] 4451:3 focusing [1] 4429:8 folks [1] 4413:25 follow [3] 4439:4 4489:23 4528:4 followed [4] 4442:20 4595:5.22 4601:3 following [8] 4415:18 4442:19 4457:22 4528:15 4568:23 4572: 17 4584:24 4588:6 Football [1] 4406:2 Ford [1] 4421:13 foregoing [1] 4608:3 forget [4] 4406:5 4436:23,24 4602: form [9] 4531:11,13,16,23 4535:25 4536:1 4539:13.14 4574:20 formula [2] 4519:22 4591:10 formulation [1] 4574:2 forth [1] 4550:14 forward [4] 4441:7 4460:18 4605: 8 21 found [9] 4415:22 4441:2 4444:15. 17 4446:21 4465:12 4523:6 4591: four [10] 4445:10 4447:14 4466:3 **4546**:3,7 **4562**:25,25 **4563**:1,19 4564:2 four-year [2] 4468:1 4553:10 fourth [1] 4574:22 FR [1] 4489:21 fraction [1] 4455:3 framework [1] 4597:20 Frankei [1] 4468:25 frankly [4] 4484:22 4489:9 4490: 24 4492:3 fraught [1] 4574:12 free [6] 4424:11 4445:24 4535:18 4539:22 4566:12,17 freedom [1] 4520:11 French [4] 4482:2,2,5,7 frequent [1] 4551:7 fresh [1] 4573:16 Friday [1] 4454:23 front [1] 4498:22 frustration [1] 4489:8 full [3] 4517:11 4548:15 4600:14 fully [2] 4442:11,15

functioning [1] 4424:16 functions [1] 4534:5 fund 191 4575:5,5,7,7,9,12,14,15 4584:24 fundamental [7] 4447:22 4471:12 4509:24 4540:21,23 4578:22 4602:13 fundamentally [1] 4574:9 FUNDS [3] 4400:7 4469:10 4518: funnel [1] 4426:23 further [4] 4463:13 4485:12 4560: 8 4575:10 furthermore [1] 4484:6 future [2] 4465:4.18

G gain [1] 4425:20 Gallop [1] 4512:14 game [1] 4455:8 GARRETT [45] 4401:3 4405:12,14, 17.22.23 4406:10.16 4408:22 4409:15 4410:7 4411:19 4412:2 4415:15 4417:7 4423:21,25 4424: 5,9 4425:22 4427:2 4434:22 4442: 17 4452:8 4456:15 4524:1 4526:8 4550:11 4552:21 4585:16.23 **4595**:6,12 **4596**:10,14,17 **4600**:20 **4601**:7,13 **4603**:4,7 **4605**:13,15 4607:3,13 GASANBEKOVA [1] 4402:6 Gaston [1] 4403:10 gave [8] 4421:9 4438:13 4473:1 **4562:**15 **4573**:9.15 **4598**:10 **4599**: general [7] 4458:22 4540:19 4549: 1 4554:21 4555:13 4587:10 4593: Я generated [1] 4598:3 generates [1] 4431:14 generation [2] 4478:22 4486:16 geographic [4] 4479:24 4482:3 **4521:13 4590:19** geographies [3] 4505:20 4512:16, geography [2] 4505:13 4513:10 George [9] 4467:12 4470:5 4480:1, 13.17 4481:6 4498:7 4510:8 4578: George's [2] 4486:21 4511:9 gets [10] 4488:24 4512:24 4514:8 4518:12,20 4534:25 4571:23 4596:19,20 4602:10 getting [6] 4419:21 4424:18 4433: 24 4567:4,13 4571:8 give [8] 4435:25 4441:16 4470:2 **4489**:10 **4498**:6 **4523**:23 **4557**:18 4588:7 given [17] 4407:13 4435:2 4448:8 4449:15 4452:5 4475:18,24 4476:

11 4508:24,25 4540:3,6 4551:16

4552:1 4592:3,4 **4593:**12

gives [5] 4470:1,5,8 4516:4 4606:3 giving [4] 4438:12 4456:12 4491:9 4562:11 glean [2] 4565:11 4567:17 qlobal [4] 4466:13,14,15,21 goal [4] 4508:23 4565:25 4570:6,7 aolf [2] 4436:11.14 got [25] 4411:13,17 4412:9 4414:8 4416:21 4422:14 4429:11 4433: 15.25 4434:10 4435:10 4461:10 4467:20 4473:4 4474:6 4479:4 **4485:**16 **4500:**11 **4512:**1 **4545:**15 4579:17 4583:12,13,19 4595:15 gotten [3] 4580:13 4583:23.25 governmental [1] 4536:7 Gracenote [1] 4546:9 gradually [1] 4412:24 grant [6] 4530:14 4531:10 4537:1, 2.3 4539:10 granted [4] 4529:22,25 4537:24 4539:6 grants [1] 4534:11 graph [2] 4421:19 4423:4 graphically [1] 4494:9 grappling [1] 4417:6 grasp [1] 4548:22 Gray [51] 4407:20,25 4415:19 4416: 7,13 4417:8 4419:24 4422:12 4429:10 4433:15 4441:18 4449:7 4452:16 4453:23 4454:8,9,15,17, 19,25 4456:7,25 4457:14,22 4459: 3,8 4477:7,7 4535:15 4536:15 **4539:**13 **4545:**5 **4546:**7,13 **4548:** 19 4549:1 4550:3 4551:3.18 4553: 21 4564:23 4565:2.7 4576:25 4579:15 4581:7 4588:21.24 4589: 4.10 4601:25 Gray's [33] 4408:2 4413:20 4414: 19 4422:16 4425:4 4426:18 4430: 22 4432:10 4433:21 4449:16 4454:8 4455:16,22 4457:6,24 4458:13 4460:8 4469:20 4470:7 4477:12 4526:9 4545:12,22 4550: 6.8 4551:25 4553:6 4564:22 4568: 23 4569:15 4575:1 4576:8 4593: 25 great [4] 4431:5 4472:3 4475:7 4496:3 greatly [1] 4465:21 green [4] 4433:3 4512:22 4513:21 4514:14 Greg [1] 4525:3 **GREGORY** [1] 4402:3 grew [1] 4595:14 Grimm [1] 4423:10 ground [2] 4410:9 4484:13 Group [15] 4403:2 4451:6 4468:5 4478:15 4485:22 4492:14 4493:5, 15,23 4511:21,22 4575:13 4577:4 4578:16,25

groups [19] 4438:18 4445:17 4471:

12 4474:7 4479:19 4494:2 4495:

12.14 4496:19 4506:3,11 4512:23 4535:4,5 4577:12,19,21 4579:7 4589:9 growing [1] 4427:25 growth [1] 4461:24 Gruen [1] 4421:6 quess [3] 4440:13 4584:2 4594:6 quided [1] 4592:5

half [4] 4422:20 4472:22 4577:5 4582:19 half-hour [1] 4422:20 Hamilton [3] 4414:3 4427:7 4542: Haminov [2] 4417:13 4420:16 Haminov's [2] 4417:20 4418:15 hand [4] 4477:7 4502:17,18 4606: hands [2] 4605:18.19 happened [3] 4416:22 4548:9 4581:25 happening [3] 4451:19 4549:16 **4582**:2 happens [2] 4455:5 4570:8 happy [1] 4605:24 hard [7] 4408:5 4409:19 4413:22 4414:12,17 4416:17 4443:9 Harvey's [1] 4431:12 hat [1] 4566:3 hate [1] 4478:18 HBO [1] 4544:3 head [1] 4526:6 heads-up [1] 4488:4 health [1] 4595:9 hear [2] 4524:7 4596:23 heard [8] 4413:8,10 4458:25 4478: 20 4584:3,12 4586:14 4596:22 hearing [6] 4406:5 4410:8 4414: 23 4442:3 4585:5 4606:9 hearings [3] 4430:14 4435:11 4596:25 heavily [2] 4510:17 4568:11 held [1] 4467:6 help [3] 4503:3 4568:5 4584:8 helpful [4] 4441:2 4453:8 4581:18 4582:6 heuristic [1] 4573:18 high [3] 4464:15 4513:15 4554:7 higher [14] 4416:13 4423:16 4471: 9 4480:16 4486:16 4492:23 4513: 3,7,9,24 4514:6,9 4570:22 4588: higher-fee [3] 4505:2 4512:4,5

highest [6] 4469:15 4470:1,4,6,9 4576:19 highlights [2] 4471:25 4564:19

highly [4] 4468:7 4469:21 4519:19 4520:17 himself [3] 4459:3 4465:24 4584:8

historically [1] 4482:5 history [4] 4452:25 4489:6 4557:3 4584:19

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

function [3] 4514:3 4535:14 4536:

Docket No. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) April 24, 2018

hoc [1] 4470:19 Hochberg [1] 4406:3 Hockey [1] 4526:21 holders [1] 4527:2 HOLMES [1] 4402:4 homogenous [1] 4429:12 Honor [38] 4405:14,17 4406:11,17 4408:23 4409:16 4411:20 4415: 15 4424:5 4425:4,22 4427:3 4434: 23 4464:9 4487:5,9 4488:10 4494: 7 4501:2 4503:2 4522:17 4524:11 **4525**:3,12,24 **4556**:18 **4575**:24 4576:5 4577:14 4578:8 4579:20 4582:12 4584:3,6 4596:15,21 4601:24 4603:10 HONORABLE [3] 4400:9,10,11 Honors [20] 4405:23 4439:4,19 4440:12 4455:6 4464:6 4465:17 4466:12,23 4467:6 4471:18 4475: 20 4476:2.12 4478:3.17 4578:9 4580:11 4584:9 4585:4 Honors' [1] 4478:1 hope [3] 4441:1 4537:4 4605:15 hopefully [1] 4526:10 hoping [1] 4525:7 Horowitz [29] 4407:11,13,23 4434: 16 4435:1,21 4436:20 4437:11,21 4438:2,4,20 4441:18 4467:13 4473:16 4476:22 4477:2 4491:7 4522:19 4523:12 4554:17,19 **4564**:4 **4574**:17,25 **4593**:13,23,25 4603:23 Horowitz's [2] 4554:4,8 horse [1] 4437:12 host [1] 4555:18 hour [10] 4405:18 4420:1,2,2,3 4422:21 4459:10 4475:15,16 4523:22 hours [7] 4415:9,18 4426:6 4437:7 4473:2 4490:23 4517:22 household 5 4426:10 4433:17 4434:7.7 4586:16 households [9] 4422:25 4423:1.2 4431:16.19 4455:23 4553:23 4586:16,19 however [14] 4471:12 4490:6 **4511**:10 **4515**:4 **4532**:23 **4536**:2 4550:14 4551:25 4557:1 4567:16, 21 4574:14 4576:14 4593:16 hullabaloo [1] 4548:23 hundreds [3] 4427:10.10 4527:1 hunt [1] 4421:15 HUNZIKER [1] 4402:16 hurt [2] 4432:8,8 hypotheses [2] 4589:14,20 hypothesis [4] 4522:22 4523:3 4576:18 4589:24 hypothesized [1] 4576:16 hypothetical [33] 4418:22 4419:2, 9 4468:20 4527:8 4528:1,19,22 **4533**:16,20,24 **4535**:13 **4536**:17

21 4556:5 4557:23 4559:13 4573: 19 4596:24 4597:5,15,23 4598:7, 12,15 4599:5,21 4600:8,23 IAIN [1] 4401:13 idea [4] 4481:11 4482:13 4486:6 4541:20 identical [1] 4447:11 identified [5] 4442:23 4444:2,23 4470:18 4574:21 identify [1] 4472:22 ignore [1] 4570:8 ignores [2] 4558:14 4574:3 ignoring [1] 4556:17 III [15] 4428:25 4429:7,9,16,18,19, 23 4430:1 4433:19 4439:22 4459: 14.16.22.25 4603:13 illustrate [1] 4449:15 illustrates [1] 4470:22 immediately [1] 4595:22 impact [3] 4455:13 4465:15 4551: imperfect [2] 4416:8,10 implicit [1] 4507:2 important [30] 4411:16 4412:4,19

implicitly [2] 4515:9,15 implied [1] 4504:4 imply [1] 4518:16 importance [1] 4570:21 4414:16 4430:14 4431:4,21 4437: 19 4439:6 4449:25 4452:18 4454: 12 4458:11 4466:22 4476:20 4491:19 4505:13,22 4506:14 4513:9 4535:10 4544:6 4545:2 4547:23 4551:6 4578:11 4580:23 4586:20 4598:8 4604:13 importantly [5] 4468:10 4474:5 4494:18 4495:25 4514:7 imposed [1] 4558:1 impossible [1] 4591:16 impression [1] 4436:7 improper [1] 4435:4 improve [1] 4439:12 improved [6] 4443:19,20 4444:8 4465:2 4548:9,10 improvement [1] 4446:15 improvements [3] 4444:4 4445:9 4446:11 improves [1] 4465:21 imputed [1] 4460:10

inaccurate [1] 4456:9

4485:17 4486:2

includes [1] 4526:22

inappropriate [2] 4430:16 4447:

incidentally [2] 4427:15 4599:11

include [3] 4483:21 4489:24 4529:

included [4] 4454:14 4456:24

including [6] 4472:14 4475:25

4485:1 4495:9 4527:2 4574:12

income [2] 4513:24 4535:20

incomes [1] 4513:20 incomplete [1] 4574:4 inconsistency [2] 4411:17,20 inconsistent [7] 4489:10 4511:13 4561:17 4563:20,22 4564:2,8 incorporated [1] 4495:17 incorrect [3] 4497:13 4553:1 4591 increase [7] 4445:21 4446:2 4457: 25 4462:5 4510:19 4580:10 4581: increased [6] 4464:12 4580:6 4582:1.17.22 4591:11 increases [1] 4458:2 increasingly [2] 4474:11 4551:6 incredibly [1] 4482:24 Indeed [1] 4465:23 Independence [1] 4400:15 independent [4] 4410:20 4444:20 4456:23 4519:5 independently [4] 4446:22 4447: 8 4448:9 4456:22 indicate [2] 4496:13 4510:9 indicated [1] 4439:19 indicates [2] 4499:6 4503:15 indication [1] 4545:20 indicative [1] 4510:10 indicator (1) 4495:5 indicators [1] 4522:20 indicia [1] 4545:20 individual [4] 4533:2.13 4538:11 4539:19 individuals [1] 4439:20 industry [12] 4413:11,16,25 4422: 8 4426:14 4439:20 4452:15,19 4458:24 4467:9 4541:22 4587:9 ineffective [1] 4456:9 infer [1] 4548:6 inferential [2] 4515:3,19 infinitum [1] 4516:9 inflate [1] 4432:15 influence 4 4424:2 4519:23,24, influenced [6] 4559:21.25 4560: 10,14,21,24 influences [1] 4592:22 infomercial [1] 4426:9 information [26] 4416:22 4418:17 4420:4,5 4425:20,23 4444:21 4457:4 4475:24 4515:17 4542:5 4543:22 4544:9,10 4567:3,4,8 4569:12 4570:11 4571:1,5,8,12 4576:14 4592:21 4603:16 informed [1] 4560:17 inherent [1] 4529:2 initial 19 4450:19 4469:6 4516:17 4518:4 4523:24 4525:15 4573:18 4584:25 4594:18 innovation [1] 4578:17 input [1] 4550:1 inquired [1] 4560:8

inquisitive [3] 4583:16,19,20 insert [2] 4419:19,20 inserted [1] 4419:10 inside [1] 4484:18 insight [1] 4482:16 insignificant [2] 4496:12 4521:14 insisted [1] 4456:3 insofar [1] 4555:12 instance [1] 4470:11 instances [1] 4535:16 instead [4] 4447:12 4457:24 4530: 15 4589:16 instrumental [1] 4587:15 intended [5] 4406:21 4410:14 4434:2 4573:24 4588:7 intent [1] 4490:7 interest [5] 4439:19 4540:13,16 4572:21 4597:1 interested 3 4573:6 4591:17 4604:24 interesting [4] 4441:2:4469:12: 4525:4,25 interestingly [1] 4447:18 interests [2] 4449:23 4450:2 intermediary [1] 4597:7 internal [1] 4606:2 interpret [8] 4495:7 4497:6,12 4503:23 4509:25 4510:2 4518:14 interpretation [5] 4495:23 4497: 14 4515:15 4519:18 4520:2 interpretations [1] 4506:6 interpreted [1] 4497:10 interpreting [3] 4491:22 4498:13 4515:23 interval [1] 4476:7 intervals [2] 4465:11 4468:12 interviewer [1] 4473:1 interviewing [1] 4557:4 introduced [2] 4420:22 4485:9 invalid [4] 4453:24 4474:4 4475:1, Invictus [1] 4526:5 involve [1] 4476:23 involvement [1] 4536:7 involves [1] 4468:21 IPG [1] 4429:17 irrelevant [2] 4417:9 4535:8 isn't [11] 4416:25 4458:19 4493:12 4494:12.18.19 4506:24 4507:9 4514:19 4572:23 4599:4 isolate [1] 4519:25 isolates [1] 4550:15 Israel [20] 4407:4 4415:17.22 4416: 18 4426:21 4428:21 4439:16 4447:9 4473:20 4476:9 4497:25 4506:13 4510:4 4517:7 4518:23 4521:12 4529:1 4571:17 4590:4 4605:1 Israel's [13] 4414:24 4416:23 4427: 17 4476:5 4481:10 4500:16.17

inquiring [1] 4595:9

4538:3 4542:23 4543:3,14 4545:

4502:22 4504:1,3 4506:7 4521:17

4578:14

issue [18] 4433:18 4435:7,17 4460: 4.5 4465:8 4485:4 4489:19 4496: 23 4513:12 4516:22 4529:16 4530:20 4531:3 4579:12 4596:25 4605:4.6

issues [14] 4411:4 4417:19 4435: 17 4439:12 4444:6,24,25 4446:6 4526:4 4569:9 4574:12 4578:19 4580:5 4588:20 items [1] 4581:14

itself [11] 4453:22 4465:12 4485: 19 4486:10 4532:5 4533:17 4543: 6 4548:19,20 4579:25 4587:16

J

Jane [1] 4526:14

jelly [1] 4433:3 JESSE [1] 4400:10 **JESSICA** [1] 4404:5 job [5] 4416:5 4421:7 4441:3 4542: 1 4580:2 Joe [2] 4400:23 4608:9 JOHN [1] 4401:19 Joint [23] 4401:2 4405:21,23 4406: 22 4407;4,5,9,16 4423;5,7 4469; 21 4470:2 4471:4 4483:13 4484: 23 4507:7 4535:8 4556:2,6 4557: 21 4582:24 4596:13 4606:4 Josie [2] 4595:23,23 Jr [3] 4401:19 4402:14,16 JSC [16] 4406:24 4415:7,20,23 4416:6 4420:8 4424:18 4427:5,18 4431:13,17 4445:1 4463:11 4523: 6 4550:16 4571:21 JSC's [1] 4414:19 JUDGE [135] 4405:3.15.19 4406:4. 12.14 4408:14 4409:6,24 4411:7 4415:12 4416:25 4423:20,25 4424:7 4425:10 4426:23 4434:19 4440:14,20 4448:16 4449:3 4463: 18,24 4464:4 4469:1 4478:6,8,11 4487:3,6,10 4488:2,18,24 4493:9 4495:16 4496:5.8 4497:20 4499:9. 14,24 4500:12,20,25 4501:8,17,22 **4502**:1,7,11,19,23 **4503**:20 **4504**: 19 4505:4,24 4506:10,19 4507:18 **4508**:10 **4509**:2,6 **4510**:7 **4511**:5 4512:24 4513:11 4521:23 4522:6, 13 4523:18,21 4524:2,17,21,25 4525:6,9,18 4532:2,12 4537:12,15 4538:2 4543:12 4547:2,6 4565:19 4566:8 4567:2 4568:2,16 4569:21, 24 4570:24 4572:2,5,9,13 4575:18 4576:2,7,9 4577:10,22 4578:3 **4581**:10 **4582**:7,13 **4583**:15 **4585**: 7,10,21 4587:5 4593:2,6,24 4594: 24 4595:2,13 4596:8,10 4599:6 4600:14 4601:4,10 4602:19,23,24 4603:1,2,5 4605:12,17 Judge-created [1] 4524:19

JUDGES [39] 4400:1 4408:23,25

4409:2 **4412:**16,25 **4417:**19 **4421:**

11.14 4438:25 4439:14 4442:20. 24 4443:17 4444:2 4445:4 4457:1 4461:3,5,22 4462:24 4465:6,12 4469:19 4470:15 4479:6 4489:3, 22 4520:5 4523:10,17 4528:17 4536:10 4574:15 4575:4 4584:23 4589:18 4592:10 4597:2 Judges' [5] 4412:17,25 4414:6 4488:20 4489:8 jump [1] 4420:19 jumped [1] 4428:12 justification [1] 4432:10 justifications [2] 4517:7,13 justify [4] 4430:24 4433:5,9 4586: 10

Karen [1] 4608:12 Kaye [1] 4401:8 keep [7] 4437:25 4483:5,23 4531:2, 8 4535:2 4595:21 keeping [1] 4533:15 KENDALL [2] 4403:3 4478:17 kept [2] 4456:3 4596:25 key [5] 4435:12 4446:17 4492:8 4515:5 4598:16 KIENTZLE [1] 4401:6 kind [7] 4419:21 4420:15.16 4425: 25 4427:13 4515:12 4518:9 kinds [14] 4417:19 4419:15 4420: 13 4424:19,20 4428:10 4436:10 4437:13 4439:2 4495:15 4496:17, 19 4602:16 4604:2 knowledge [3] 4536:14 4556:22 4560:17 known [1] 4541:22

knows [2] 4474:21 4586:6

Knupp [1] 4402:8

latest [1] 4452:25

LAANE [2] 4401:4 4525:12 lack [4] 4411:12 4556:10,11,14 lacking [1] 4513:16 lacks [1] 4562:20 lag [1] 4564:12 laid [4] 4470:24 4472:2 4475:6 4480:19 language [6] 4454:13 4529:13 4556:15 4557:22 4588:16 4592:6 large [5] 4431:14 4561:7 4571:18 4580:10 4596:19 largely [1] 4465:10 larger [4] 4428:6 4474:6 4506:22, largest [1] 4580:25 Larson [1] 4403:10 last [14] 4412:17 4417:13 4438:24 **4440:**6 **4521:**8 **4525:**5,10,11,15 4533:21 4581:25 4589:3 4594:6 4605:10 late [1] 4488:6 later [3] 4407:15 4491:22 4576:21

Laughter [12] 4412:1 4434:21 4547:8 4568:15 4583:17 4585:20 **4595**:4,11 **4596**:5,16 **4605**:11,16 launching [1] 4500:22 law [17] 4408:20 4410:6,15 4412:3 4466:11 4479:23 4489:1,16 4500: 7 4529:5 4532:1 4533:6,7 4543:6, 7 4601:5.8 lawyers [1] 4406:9 layman's [1] 4520:11 leads [2] 4491:24 4509:25 League [5] 4405:25 4406:2 4475: 19 4526:20,21 leap [1] 4586:11 leaps [2] 4515:3.19 learned [1] 4468:19 least [10] 4414:19 4418:2 4420:8 4439:21 4483:18 4545:2 4576:17 **4577:**8 **4580:**23 **4592:**13 leave [3] 4466:16 4470:15 4523:8 leaving [1] 4570:10 led [3] 4409:17 4420:23 4522:10 left [5] 4440:13 4476:11 4485:18 4546:22 4548:4 left-handed [1] 4433:2 legacy [2] 4551:10 4569:8 legal [1] 4528:16 legislative [1] 4489:6 lengths [1] 4445:2 lens [1] 4528:16

less [24] 4407:21 4413:1,1 4431:6, 7.9 4455:24 4470:1 4479:5 4483: 18 **4484:**3 **4496:**1 **4498:**17.18 4508:1,6,25 4511:19 4514:17 **4551:**6,6 **4581:**7 **4603:**24,25 level [11] 4423:14,17 4450:12,24 4451:3 4474:12 4508:7,24 4516:8 4517:3 4578:16 level-level [1] 4506:14 levels [2] 4512:18 4547:21 levied [2] 4446:8 4449:4 Librarian [5] 4409:3 4599:9,10,14

4600:17 Librarian's [1] 4429:22 Library [2] 4400:2,13 license [14] 4416:2 4418:7,10 4419:5,17 4422:2 4527:11 4528:6 4530:14,16 4558:3,23 4565:1 4600:2

licenses [4] 4530:3,8 4557:25 **4558:**5 licensing [3] 4411:1 4534:13

4551:15 lies [1] 4523:16 life [1] 4584:14

light [2] 4524:11 4575:10 lighter [1] 4513:21 likelihood [1] 4509:17

likely [7] 4496:15 4504:14 4507:25 4508:1,25 4577:8 4592:20 limitation [1] 4530:11

limited [4] 4415:1,2 4483:9 4549:

limits 3 4405:11 4465:7,9 Lindstrom [12] 4433:16 4454:17 **4541:**8,24,25 **4547:**3,9 **4548:**12 4549:2.4 4550:25 4551:18 Lindstrom's [3] 4546:18.19 4548:

line [15] 4432:15 4440:5 4453:9 4497:12 4498:14,17,19,21,23 **4499:**23,24,25 **4500:**1,2 **4526:**5 linear [1] 4500:2

lines [1] 4577:13 lineup [1] 4416:1

listen [1] 4587:14

lineups [2] 4483:3.3

list [5] 4435:9 4473:2,5 4556:8 4598:19

listened [1] 4481:9 listening 2 4434:20 4526:1 litany [1] 4581:11

literally [1] 4510:5 litigated [2] 4412:21 4598:23 little [15] 4422:16 4426:8 4427:25

4432:5 4435:10 4438:20 4483:1 **4486:1 4488:**6,23 **4500:**6 **4523:**22 4554:6 4555:8 4597:2

live [3] 4435:23 4475:15 4554:24 lives [2] 4413:10 4557:3

LLP [8] 4401:8.14.22 4402:8.17 4403:10.18 4404:6

local [25] 4434:10,10,12,13 4460:9, 11,15,16 **4480:**8,9 **4496:**22 **4504**: 16 **4507**:4 **4510**:17 **4534**:12,16 **4543**:15 **4545**:24 **4546**:16 **4547**:

17 **4573**:2 **4577**:9 **4590**:13 **4604**: 18.19

localized [1] 4547:21 locally [1] 4536:24 location [2] 4590:14,20 log 3 4506:17 4519:1,5

log-level [1] 4506:16 logic [1] 4533:9

logs [1] 4546:10 long 5 4426:8 4429:11 4452:25 4485:21 4602:9

long-established [1] 4558:15 long-time [1] 4599:23

longer [5] 4435:10 4484:21 4548: 12,16 4582:20

look [48] 4409:16,18 4410:13 4412: 15 **4414**:12 **4418**:19 **4421**:25 4422:8 4425:10 4426:2 4427:3 **4433:**14 **4436:**5 **4444:**3 **4449:**15 4461:1 4462:11 4465:14 4475:13 4507:23.24 4508:4 4518:20 4520: 13.23 4521:8 4543:4.23 4544:1 **4552:**25 **4555:**20.25 **4565:**12.14 **4567:**23 **4569:**10 **4570:**16 **4571:** 14 **4573**:16 **4579**:13 **4584**:7 **4586**: 15,20 4588:5 4598:15 4604:3

look-alike [1] 4580:19

4605:8.20

looked [9] 4429:6 4443:14 4508:6. 9 4509:16 4578:15,15 4591:21,21 looking [16] 4418:18 4420:4 4422: 24 4425:12,15 4508:15 4514:15 4537:19 4560:9 4562:24 4563:18 4565:10 4571:2 4582:6 4602:3 4603:14 looks [3] 4414:25 4427:17 4569: loosely [1] 4488:23 Los [1] 4403:11 lose [3] 4544:5 4570:20,20 losing [1] 4510:11 loss [2] 4458:2,4 lot [20] 4412:11,21 4422:7 4430:13 4434:3 4436:16 4438:21 4479:3 4480:22 4490:15 4514:12,17 4524:21 4548:21,24 4549:2 4554: 3 4570:10 4582:19 4583:14 lots [3] 4451:19 4580:12 4583:11 Loughery [1] 4406:1 love [2] 4592:3 4604:11 low [5] 4473:18 4496:11 4543:17 4588:8 4589:24 low-receipt [1] 4515:11 lower [26] 4447:20 4448:6 4469:15 18,23 **4492**:13,21,23 **4494**:19 4497:5,8 4498:24,25 4503:7 4510: 22 4512:9 4513:19,19,20 4514:1 4515:4,13 4519:14 4520:2 4578: 25 4603:23 lower-fee [4] 4493:4 4495:3 4504: 25 4512:2 LPMs [1] 4547:17 lucky [1] 4605:19 LUCY [1] 4402:4 LUTZKER [3] 4403:16,18,18

M

MACE [1] 4401:21 MacLEAN [57] 4404:3 4487:5,8 4488:2,10 4494:6 4495:19 4496:7, 10 4497:25 4499:12,19 4500:1,14, 24 4501:2.12.21.25 4502:4.10.13. 21 4503:1,21 4504:22 4505:10 4506:4,12 4507:15,20 4508:22 **4509**:4,12 **4511**:3,8 **4513**:7 **4514**: 23 4522:2,8,16 4523:19,20 4524: 12 4575:21,23 4576:5 4577:14 4578:12,21 4589:12,13 4590:22 4591:6 4605:23 4607:7,10 made [37] 4408:19 4416:6 4429:15 4430:17 4432:20 4439:13 4443: 16 4445:8 4449:7,7 4451:12 4452: 8 4460:9 4461:22 4462:1 4474:11 4487:1 4507:3 4508:10 4515:7 4516:4 4520:4 4546:12 4558:4 4565:20 4570:17 4578:17 4579: 20 4586:5 4588:10,23 4589:7 4591:22 4594:7 4595:6 4599:16 4600:21 Madison [1] 4400:14 magnitude [3] 4447:16 4491:10

4522:21 magnitudes [1] 4523:14 mainstay [1] 4599:23 Major [8] 4405:25 4415:4 4439:25 4475:19 4476:21 4526:20 4546:8, majority [1] 4571:19 maker [1] 4411:5 makers [2] 4440:7 4461:10 mandatory [1] 4570:1 manipulation [1] 4590:24 manipulations [1] 4590:25 manner [1] 4575:8 mantle [1] 4452:18 manufactured [1] 4600:4 many [26] 4417:23 4420:22,22 4422:9,13 4425:7 4433:2 4443:25 4453:5 4472:18 4474:15,25 4475: 3 4477:4 4478:20 4485:5,15,16 4512:6 4526:3 4530:3 4540:18 4583:5 4586:16,19 4593:16 map [4] 4460:14 4512:13 4563:7 4589:25 marginal [5] 4491:23 4498:14 4500:4,9 4573:21 mark [2] 4533:14 4554:7 market [89] 4409:20,22 4410:2 4413:14,17,21 4416:11 4417:5 4425:14,21 4448:20 4480:7 4481: 5 4494:12 4495:11 4499:12,13 4504:9 4505:6 4527:21 4528:1.5, 22,24 4529:3 4532:22 4533:17,20, 24 4534:1,3,5,13,15,16,19 4535: 11,13,14,17,18 4536:2,5,16,17,18, 19,19 **4537:**8,8,18,24 **4538:**3 **4539**: 5,5,7,8,16,20,22 **4540**:4,9 **4541**:9 4542:20,23 4543:3,11,14 4545:20, 21 4555:19,20,25 4556:5,10 4557: 15.23 **4558:**11,15,19,25 **4559:**15, 16 4561:3,5,6 4562:12 4574:7 marketplace [84] 4406:21 4408: 12 4409:5 4414:25 4415:7 4416:9, 14 4417:18 4418:3,18,20,22 4419: 2,9,24 4424:11,13,17,25 4426:3 4427:4,19 4428:7,9 4431:4 4436: 9,14 4439:17 4440:3 4445:22 4449:1 4452:22 4453:2,7 4466:2 4467:7,15 4468:21 4471:6 4480:2 **4481:**14 **4527:**6,7,13,24 **4528:**12, 20 4530:24 4533:11,23 4541:4,13 **4555**:17 **4557**:3,9,11,24 **4558**:17 **4559:**4,8,13 **4560:**18 **4561:**18,22 **4562:1 4569:17.19 4574:13 4592:** 20 4596:24 4597:6,15,23 4598:12, 15,25 4599:5,19,21 4600:1,8,23 4601:23 4604:10

marketplaces [1] 4426:17

markets [12] 4425:12,19 4434:12

4512:21 4535:22 4536:18 4590:

4458:18 4480:8,9,10 4504:16

marks [1] 4460:14 mask [1] 4547:7 Massachusetts [1] 4401:9 match 3 4436:11 4475:10 4591:6 material [1] 4551:20 math [2] 4463:10 4516:16 mathematical [2] 4463:13 4545: 1 1 1 Mathiowetz [5] 4556:13 4557:13 4561:15,16,23 | MATTER 6 4400:4 4429:5 4504: 8 4539:22 4573:3 4600:22 mattered [2] 4542:11,13 matters [4] 4540:19 4542:17,22 4584:14 MATTHEW [1] 4404:3 maximize [3] 4565:25 4573:22 4594:9 maximum [1] 4437:7 McLaughlin [7] 4406:24 4418:11 4419:12 4461:20 4473:11 4522: 20 4583:4 McLean's [1] 4524:18 McPHIE [1] 4401:13 mean [20] 4432:6 4468:19 4481:9 4498:19 4503:2 4504:20 4505:6 4509:23 4510:5 4512:3.4.7 4513: 2 4515:4 4549:1 4563:6 4566:21 4593:3,4 4603:21 meaning [2] 4422:6 4559:21 meaningful [2] 4435:7 4496:8 meaningless [2] 4541:7 4552:24 means [22] 4422:7 4474:13 4492: 17,19,20,25 4494:8 4498:23,24 **4501:14 4505:**3,10,14 **4512:**5 4520:8 4522:25 4529:15 4536:6 4577:24 4584:11 4590:6 4593:20 meant [2] 4547:2 4548:22 measure [24] 4408:12 4416:8.10 4422:18,22 4434:12 4452:21 4456:14 4458:13 4466:5 4498:14. 21 4500:4,5,9 4509:16 4545:24 4548:2 4581:16 4588:18 4598:4, 22 4603:9 4604:9 measured [5] 4424:3 4457:24 4458:17,18 4586:12 measurement [1] 4458:24 measures [13] 4433:11 4465:23 4468:8 4471:5 4473:10 4491:23 4502:16 4556:20 4589:16 4592: 24 4598:21 4602:6.7 measuring [12] 4411:10 11 4447: 3 4465:4,5 4518:6 4547:15 4556: 16 **4587:**24,25 **4589**:15 **4590**:18 media [2] 4541:14 4587:20 meet [5] 4456:25 4461:8 4520:24 4542:2 4606:6 meeting [1] 4570:6 meets [1] 4593:25 meld [1] 4438:17 Mellis [1] 4405:25 mention 5 4421:18 4548:14

4551:24 4555:14 4604:23 mentioned [4] 4444:22 4542:21 4581:14 4589:4 mere [2] 4467:8 4566:20 merely [3] 4489:16 4527:24 4571: merge [1] 4532:25 merits [1] 4409:14 met [4] 4461:13 4490:1 4546:23 4547:4 Meter [1] 4460:15 meters [1] 4547:18 method [7] 4465:12,25 4467:17 4479:15 4523:5 4547:14 4601:19 methodological খে 4527:15 **4528**:18 **4531**:1 **4548**:8 **4588**:23 4592:10,16 4593:7 methodologically [2] 4457:5,7 methodologies [8] 4409:13 4443: 13 4448:11 4469:16 4491:4 4531: 15 4534:2 4554:8 methodology [18] 4413:7 4439:10 4457:22 4460:8 4467:2,4 4468:5 4469:20 4470:1 4474:3.4 4475:5 4528:10.11 4533:9 4540:15 4545: 5 4547:13 methods [3] 4410:2 4533:12 4583: metrics [2] 4421:14 4544:18 MICHAEL [2] 4401:6 4404:4 midpoint [1] 4463:5 might [10] 4426:11 4460:3 4476:14 4488:6 4510:10,21 4547:4 4576: 13 **4589:**15 **4592:**23 Mike [1] 4405:24 million 3 4431:2 4553:8,11 millions [1] 4520:14 mind [12] 4437:25 4469:4 4483:5. 24 4531:2.8 4533:16 4535:3 4561: 19 4562:1,4,6 mine [1] 4511:6 mini [1] 4483:1 minimis [1] 4543:18 minimize [1] 4588:21 minimum [34] 4449:9,18 4450:5, 12,17,22 4451:20 4565:5,14,21 4566:5,23,24 4567:5,20,22 4568:7, 24 4569:4,16 4570:1,10 4571:2 4576:8,11,17,25 4579:12 4588:10, 12 4589:6 4604:25 4605:2,4 minute [11] 4426:11 4476:11 4500: 4.10 4518:8.9 4575:25 4576:2.6 4583:1 4586:17 minutes [58] 4405:18 4422:18 4426:8 4438:22,23 4440:13,19 **4462:**10,10,13,14,20 **4463:**25 4464:2 4487:9 4492:15,22 4493:7 4494:21 4495:4,9 4496:2,4 4497: 1,17 4499:2,3 4500:10 4502:18 4503:12 4504:6,13,14 4505:2,16 4512:2,6,11 4515:9,12 4516:14 4518:5 4524:13,16 4525:8 4545:

13 4563:11 4572:7 4575:17 4576: 19 4578:5 4579:1 4581:1 4585:8 4594:24 4595:9 4596:2 4602:12 mischaracterizing [2] 4510:25 4570:25 misinterpretation [1] 4491:20 misleading @ 4435:3 4452:10 4545:11,16 4561:13 4586:9 misleadingly [1] 4455:15 misses [1] 4419:25 missing [4] 4434:13 4473:21 4598: 9.11 mistake [3] 4456:4 4595:6 4596: misunderstanding [1] 4578:22 misunderstands [1] 4543:3 misunderstood [1] 4474:23 misused [1] 4434:1 Mitch [1] 4405:25 Mitchell [1] 4402:8 mix [6] 4565:14 4567:24 4568:8 4570:5 4571:14.19 mixed [1] 4601:7 model [3] 4520:19 4550:2.7 models [1] 4561:14 modifications [1] 4481:7 modified [2] 4490:4 4522:18 moment [5] 4408:15 4511:11 4581:10 4582:11 4592:7 money [5] 4423:12 4480:22 4510: 15 4514:2,4 months [1] 4534:23 moreover [2] 4458:22 4546:23 Moring [1] 4401:22 morning [11] 4405:22 4406:18 4426:10 4440:22 4441:5 4464:6, 17 4475:17 4476:13 4583:11 4600:16 most [36] 4412;4.18 4422;15 4431; 1 4433:17 4435:15 4442:21 4444: 15 4458:11 4464:22 4467:22 4468:10 4469:21 4472:17 4474:5 4476:3 4490:14,20 4491:18 4504: 14 4528:11,11 4535:9 4540:7,14, 21,23 4547:14,23 4553:16 4569:5 4574:6,6 4576:12 4603:12 4604: mostly [1] 4491:5 motion [2] 4529:8,14 move [2] 4454:18 4463:21 moved [2] 4580:19 4596:3 movies [6] 4475:9,11 4529:15 4568:14,20,25 MPAA [5] 4437:24 4456:13 4546: 23.24 4588:10 Ms [15] 4406:24 4414:3 4418:11 4419:12 4427:7 4458:23 4461:20 4473:11 4488:4 4526:14 4542:9, 16 4546:21 4548:4 4586:14 MSO [2] 4439:25 4472:18 MSOs [1] 4541:14 much [28] 4415:18 4420:15 4422:

21 4423:16 4427:11 4428:1.1.13 4432:9 4436:13 4438:12 4468:12 4474:6 4481:21.25 4484:21 4485: 17 4490:16 4496:16,25 4501:18 4580:2 4581:7 4584:13 4586:12 4597:16 4604:11 4605:8 Multi-casting [1] 4580:15 multi-variate [1] 4590:5 multiple [6] 4466:19 4483:1 4484: 1 4545:17.18 4577:21 multiplicative [3] 4423:18,19,20 multiplied [1] 4514:10 Multiply [3] 4500:10 4505:8 4515: multitude [1] 4480:8 Music [1] 4575:10 must [4] 4459:12 4521:2 4531:2 4586:12 mutually [2] 4448:17.21

N

N.W [8] 4401:9.15.23 4402:9.19 4403:5.19 4404:7 NAB [2] 4552:17 4588:6 name [3] 4467:13 4525:3 4602:21 names [2] 4413:15 4552:21 narrow [1] 4479:24 narrower [1] 4468:12 NASCAR [4] 4435:25 4436:1,15 4438:16 Nathan [1] 4602:25 National [7] 4406:1 4432:23 4526: 20,21 4546:15 4547:11 4552:12 nationally [4] 4432:24 4433:6,13 4474:13 nationwide [2] 4433:6 4480:25 nature [2] 4468:21 4549:9 NBA [1] 4475:18 NBC [1] 4526:18 necessarily [7] 4495:20 4498:2, 24 4514:14 4541:16,17 4548:6 necessary [3] 4522:18 4524:8 4542:24 necessitated [1] 4549:10 need [14] 4409:7 4429:2 4442:15 4452:23 4453:15 4469:2 4477:22 4492:10 4509:11 4530:3 4538:19, 20 4549:12 4592:13 needed [3] 4452:4 4530:8 4573:22 needs [4] 4449:10 4469:3 4539:8 4542:3 negative [42] 4495:6.9 4497:7.10. 11,12,13,22,24 4498:1,2,3,6,7,8, 10,12 4503:24,24 4504:2,6,24 4505:3 4509:23,23 4510:1,1,3,3,4, 6,9 4511:2,13 4512:7 4515:5,10, 14 4516:10 4518:12,15,15 negatively [1] 4521:15 negotiate [3] 4536:20 4537:9,19 negotiating [1] 4534:7 negotiation [2] 4536:7 4539:2 negotiations [1] 4539:16 Neighborhood [1] 4584:4

nested [1] 4513:13 network [18] 4414:25 4417:18 4418:2,18,20 4423:6 4428:9 4481: 21 4495:1 4504:7,9,14 4509:18 4518:10,11 4538:13 4573:3 4594: networks [14] 4417:16 4418:8.11 4420:15.16 4422:2 4423:13 4428: 4 4436:17.17 4541:14 4560:3 4561:13 4587:10 never [7] 4436:3 4458:24 4471:23 4477:24 4489:11 4601:13 4603: New [9] 4433:2 4479:12 4566:13 4578:16 4580:15 4583:19 4587:8, 23 4589:7 next [32] 4412:7 4414:15 4421:18 4423:9 4431:10 4432:2 4438:1 4441:9.14 4444:5 4461:21.22 4462:7,17,22 4463:12 4473:11 4476:2 4489:13 4493:3 4494:8 4497:18 4503:22 4516:15,21 4517:11 4588:3 4591:9 4595:8 4596:1 4605:14,21 NFL [1] 4526:22 niche 3 4495:10 4580:16 4581:6 niches [1] 4580:24 Nielsen [35] 4413:7.8.12 4434:11. 17 4452:11 4454:21 4455:25 4457:8,23 4458:7,16,18 4459:1,2 4541:11 4546:8,12,22,23 4547:3,5 **4548:**4,12,13,15,16 **4552:**6,7,19 4553:1,15 4587:13,16,19 Nielsen's [2] 4454:15 4457:12 nobody [3] 4413:9 4438:15 4496: non-duplication [1] 4594:12 non-JSC [1] 4416:6 non-network [1] 4527:10 non-participation [1] 4575:9 non-recorded [2] 4553:13,18 non-sports [2] 4423:13,16 non-WGNA [2] 4454:7 4550:7 noncompensable @ 4435:6 4461:24 4462:5 4472:23 4477:1.5 nonduplicate [1] 4462:20 nonduplicated [2] 4504:5 4516: 14 none [4] 4508:3,5,9 4546:17 nonrandom [1] 4459:18 nonresponse [1] 4472:13 nonsense [2] 4450:13 4589:11 nonsensical [1] 4460:6 noon [1] 4487:11 nor [1] 4461:12 note [6] 4438:3 4454:12 4469:24 4476:20 4548:11 4586:24 noted 3 4457:1 4465:7 4582:25 notes [1] 4608:5 nothing [10] 4422:24 4426:10 4452:15 4458:14 4468:1 4502:7

4523:2 4578:2 4601:18,20 noting [2] 4406:19 4526:15 notion [3] 4543:1 4601:21 4603:18 notionally [1] 4498:5 notwithstanding [1] 4442:2 novel [2] 4539:22 4540:2 novo [2] 4409:25 4410:8 NPM [15] 4426:10 4432:22 4433:5. 12 4434:11 4546:14,15,22 4547: 10,11,20 4548:1,1,9,10 NPM's [1] 4587:16 NPMs [1] 4547:19 number [48] 4408:17 4413:23 **4421:**24 **4422:**18.25 **4430:**19 4431:15,16,18 4432:11 4433:15 4435:3 4438:3 4439:11 4440:10 4442:2 4445:8 4454:5 4455:23 4456:21 4461:1,17 4482:16 4485: 13 4486:13 4494:15 4500:10 **4502:**18 **4504:**4,5,13 **4505:**8,12 **4514**:11 **4515**:8 **4516**:16 **4518**:3,5 **4519:**6,14,17 **4520:**2 **4545:**25 4549:20 4576:19 4577:18 4578: 19 4590:23 number-of-subscribers [1] 4519:20 numbers [14] 4416:21 4427:20,22 4430:21 4432:3,16 4443:5 4460:9 4486:17 4496:2 4552:7 4591:2 4602:16 4604:2 numerous [3] 4467:10 4471:15 4559:10 NYMAN [1] 4404:5 0

objective [4] 4410:21,22 4459:9 obligation [1] 4488:20 obligations [1] 4606:7 obscure [1] 4569:16 obscures [1] 4569:24 observable [1] 4467:15 observations [3] 4553:9,11 4577: observed [1] 4551:17 obtain [1] 4530:3 obviates [1] 4592:13 Obviously [6] 4407:19 4480:7 4481:19 4482:6 4581:21 4587:7 occur [3] 4527:11 4539:4 4540:6 occurred [1] 4492:4 odd [1] 4603:24 offer [3] 4563:24 4584:18 4592:15 offered [2] 4421:5 4483:24 offers [1] 4419:25 Office [3] 4534:9,20 4597:12 often [1] 4513:14 Okav [19] 4405:19 4413:7,11 4419: 6,11 4420:3 4429:11 4440:20 4460:7 4464:4 4494:8 4507:10 4525:9 4532:3 4537:16 4568:21 4572:8,13 4578:3 OLANIRAN [41] 4402:3 4525:1,2,3,

8,10,22,24 **4532**:7,18 **4537**:14,17 4538:6 4543:19 4547:4,9 4566:4, 22 4567:15 4568:14 4569:18.23 **4570**:13 **4571**:10 **4572**:3,6,11,14 4575:19 4586:4 4587:4.12 4588:3. 20 4589:3 4597:4 4598:10 4599:3 4602:11 4605:23 4607:8 omission [1] 4456:10 omitted [2] 4448:2,2 Omitting [1] 4453:21 once [6] 4431:5 4505:8 4516:7,12 4575:4 4586:19 One [100] 4402:18 4405:18 4407: 25 4409:2.2 4411:22 4412:16 4414:8.9.9 4415:2 4416:19.20 4417:24 4418:12 4420:12.14 4421:1 4422:21 4425:24 4426:11 4428:7 4430:19 4433:17 4434:6 4435:18 4437:25 4439:21 4440: 11 4449:3,14 4454:5 4460:25 4461:1.22 4466:21 4469:23 4473: 12 4474:21 4476:14 4479:19 4489:13,25 4491:11 4501:10 **4502:17 4503:5 4505:21,23 4506:** 8,10,11,12,15 **4510**:7 **4513**:22 4522:22 4527:8 4533:3 4535:15 4537:14,15 4538:10 4544:2 4549: 19 4557:1 4561:23 4562:19.22 4563:18 4566:12 4567:12 4568:6 **4571:**23,23 **4572:**20,20 **4576:**2,6 4577:23 4579:3,4 4580:7 4581:6, 13,23 4583:7,12 4585:18 4586:9 4587:25 4588:5 4589:20,22 4591: 4 4594:6 4597:6 4600:22 4604:23 one-hour [1] 4437:16 one-to-one [5] 4412:12 4414:4 4420:9 4425:9 4603:18 ones [14] 4432:8 4436:11 4438:5 4460:14,16 4521:21 4522:7,8,9 **4555**:12,13 **4567**:23 **4569**:5 **4577**: only [66] 4410:21 4417:7 4418:6 4423:15 4426:19 4430:3,22 4433: 4439:15 4447:24,25 4457:18 4460:14 4464:14 4466:13,15,20 4469:25,25 4470:10,12 4472:25 4473:6,23 4475:9,21 4476:6,8 4479:23 4483:8 4485:24 4489:14

17 4434:6 4437:2,2,15,17 4438:10 4495:11 4504:17 4505:14 4508: 19,23 4514:6 4521:21 4526:17 4533:11 4542:22 4544:23 4554:4, 13 4556:16 4559:7 4568:6 4569: 10 4570:9,16 4573:6 4575:12 **4577:4 4578:**13,15 **4581:**6 **4598:** 21 4604:15,19 opening [4] 4435:10 4442:1 4527: 17 4580:13 operate [2] 4481:25 4528:5

operator [9] 4439:9 4449:22 4451: 14,16 4452:5 4560:2 4587:1 4601: 22 4602:3 operator's [1] 4450:1 operators [15] 4440:2 4446:25 4447:5 4450:12 4465:16 4482:23 4485:16.24 4592:19.22 4597:8 4599:25 4600:10 4602:8.15 opinion [4] 4453:25 4484:5 4556: 20.21 opportunity [6] 4510:11,23 4511: 1 4512:9 4523:24 4603:11 opposed [5] 4408:20 4410:6 4496: 22 4527:25 4601:6 opposite [4] 4420:8 4455:17 4471: 21 4576:15 optimal [1] 4568:8 optimum [1] 4570:5 oral 151 4500:15,17 4501:4 4503:18 4516:9 order [16] 4405:7.8.9 4433:10 4447:13 4523:23 4528:15 4530:1 4539:9 4570:21,21,21 4571:3 4575:21 4577:24 4585:14 organized [4] 4531:23 4532:8 4535:7 4545:14 ostensibly [1] 4592:11 other [99] 4406:23 4407:22 4409: 12 4410:11 4413:25 4414:16 4415:24 4417:17 4419:22 4420: 11 4421:12,17 4424:19 4429:9 4432:19 4434:8.16 4435:17.19 **4436**:17,22 **4437**:7,13 **4438**:5 4439:2 4441:21 4446:8 4454:8 4456:21 4460:20 4462:18 4463:1. 16 4465:22 4466:13,16 4468:13, 15 4469:24 4470:14 4471:14 4472:4 4473:4,9,15,19 4474:9 4475:24 4477:7,19 4480:3,4,8 **4497:4 4499:21 4502:18 4503:**5 4511:17 4520:1,8 4521:1,9 4528: 2 4529:9,15 4532:21,23 4541:14 4550:17 4552:9 4554:10 4555:2.6 4559:22 4561:12 4563:8 4566:13 **4567:**13 **4569:**1 **4571:**21,25 **4575**: 13 4577:7 4579:19 4580:1,4,5,8 **4581:**8 **4582:**14,15,15 **4583:**13 4590:10 4592:14,21 4593:6 4603: 12 4604:1 others [5] 4451:12 4460:24 4501: 23 4555:14 4585:16 otherwise [4] 4466:19 4519:17 4555:2 4571:7 ought [2] 4481:3 4601:3 out [59] 4407:15 4411:11 4415:6 4416:1 4419:5 4420:14 4426:1 4437:4,5 4447:15 4450:16,16 4466:17 4470:16,24 4472:2 4475: 6 4480:19 4482:22 4488:7 4493: 24 4495:14 4508:17,23 4509:8 4513:22 4514:21 4520:6 4533:1 4534:19,24 4542:3 4543:9 4556:

12 4557:4.6.9.13 4566:3 4568:5. 24 4569:3 4570:10 4571:12 4576: 10,13,24 4577:3,10 4584:10 4587: 13,15 4590:23 4591:1 4596:7 4598:16 4600:5 4602:22 4605:18 outcome [1] 4486:25 outlier [1] 4407:19 outside [2] 4467:3 4595:14 over [22] 4411:22 4412:10 4413:14 4415:22 4416:12 4420:22 4424:2 4427:15 4431:2 4434:14 4437:1 4445:10 4451:20 4460:19 4523: 22 4524:12 4551:5,18 4558:24 4566:13 4575:24 4603:24 overall [7] 4460:12 4510:11.14.21 4559:25 4560:12 overlap [1] 4547:17 oversee [1] 4587:22 overseeing [1] 4587:19 overvalued [1] 4554:25 overview [1] 4441:61 own [14] 4409:13 4414:2 4449:16 4450:1 4455:16 4457:17 4460:23 4482:17 4502:2 4504:16 4536:10 4538:18 4552:2:4579:18 owned [1] 4535:6 Owner [19] 4419:1 4529:7 4530:13, 13 4533:2 4534:11.21.24 4535:3.6. 10 4536:21 4537:1,2,7,25 4538:14, 21 4540:9 owner's [5] 4530:18 4534:23 4540: 5.13.16 Owners [11] 4418:24 4529:8 4530: 1.4.10 4533:3 4535:20 4537:25 4539:19 4540:25 4597:8 owners' [2] 4530:22 4531:4

Р

p.m [4] 4487:15 4524:23;24 4606:9 packages [1] 4419:4 packing [1] 4560:2 page [9] 4431:24 4455:19 4516:1 4579:13 4586:24 4588:16 4592:8 4602:3 4607:2 pages [5] 4470:24 4475:7 4579:23, 24 4599:13 paid [25] 4406:12 4418:10 4423:12 4435:14 4447:6 4449:10 4450:17 4472:17 4486:15 4491:19 4494:1 4502:18 4504:13 4506:23 4513: 18:4514:17:4534:8,8 4539:18 4565:5,12,13 4567:20 4574:10 4576:23 pain [1] 4434:22 panel [2] 4588:7 4601:14 panel's [2] 4600:7.12 panels [5] 4465:18 4468:16 4489: 9.12 4578:20 paper [1] 4470:25 papers [7] 4493;16 4501;1 4502:3. 12,25 4582:25 4583:24 paragraph [2] 4469:8 4557:20 paragraphs [1] 4589:18

April 24, 2018 paramount [1] 4572:22 park [4] 4566:10,11,14,16 parks [1] 4566:11 part [24] 4412:23 4416:23,23 4418: 2 4421:19,20 4431:21 4435:18 4436:5.12 4447:21 4460:19 4471: 11 4485:15 4514:20 4526:24 4530:7 4541:2 4551:21,23 4579: 14 4598:3 4602:11 4604:6 partially [2] 4577:9.9 participants [2] 4448:20 4467:9 participate [1] 4463:15 participating [1] 4575:13 particular [25] 4410:1 4415:2 4418:13 4445:24 4451:6 4493:22 4494:4 4496:1 4501:19 4502:2 4510:12,20 4511:4,19,21 4517:8,9, 14,15 4540:20 4541:9 4567:10 4593:17 4599:1 4600:8 particularly [4] 4423:5 4471:17 4475:18 4490:18 parties [25] 4405:8.9 4412:6 4413: 24 4441:21 4444:1,24 4446:8,13 4457:13,20 4460:20 4464:23 4466:3 4469:6 4470:15 4472:4 4478:20 4480:24 4487:2 4527:4 4531:12 4532:8 4553:1 4572:11 parts [3] 4474:8.9 4534:7 party [8] 4464:9 4469:14.25.25 4470:13.13 4482:15 4572:24 Pasadena [1] 4403:12 Pasquale's [1] 4544:1 pass [1] 4604:21 past [13] 4408:9 4418:16 4420:21 4425:8 4428:13 4430:18 4461:3 4465:21 4474:16 4478:21 4482: 18 4587:17 4598:3 path [1] 4441:7 patterns [1] 4426:13 Patton [1] 4401:14 pay [40] 4422:1 4424:1,2 4449:18 4450:12 4460:25 4511:19 4513:4, 8.9.13.14.15.16 **4514:**7.8.22.25 4542:18 4556:17 4559:6 4565:13, 21 4566:5,10 4567:1,3,5,22 4568: 10.19 4569:14 4570:17.18 4571:3. 5,7,13 4576:17 4579:8 paying [21] 4492:14,21,24 4493:4, 18 4494:3 4495:3 4497:5,8 4499: 1 4503:7 4505:1.2 4514:13.17 4566:20,24,25 4567:11 4570:1,9 payment [1] 4515:4 payments [5]:4416:6 4486:4,15 4558:5,6 pays [3] 4534:11,13,20 Pennsylvania [1] 4401:23 people [18] 4412:10 4414:8 4422: 13,19,19 4460:15 4482:6 4513:14, 19 4514:6,9,12,13,16 4541:6 4547: 18 **4572:**18 **4603:**12 per [5] 4500:4,9 4553:8,12,25 percent [63] 4406:24 4407:3,6,10,

operating [1] 4483:2

operation [1] 4440:1

Docket No. 14-CRB-0010-CD (2010-2013) pieces [3] 4425:23 4442:6 4445:3 Pillsbury [1] 4404:6 pinpoint [1] 4552:13 pitfalls [1] 4467:5 Pittman [1] 4404:6 Pittsburgh [1] 4595:15 place [6] 4411:22 4511:16 4521:8 4549:11 4558:10 4566:16 plan [1] 4528:14 players [1] 4536:9 plea [1] 4586:5 please 9 4405:18 4464:3 4490: 11 4497:19 4503:22 4512:12 4516:21 4524:25 4557:19 pleasure [1] 4605:20 PLLC [1] 4403:4 PLOVNICK [1] 4402:4 plus [1] 4523:24 pocket [1] 4571:13 point [59] 4407:15 4411:13.18 4412:2 4414:16 4419:24,25 4425: 3 4428:5 4430:10 4436:18 4442: 23 4443:1 4452:8 4488:24 4491: 19 4492:2 4493:17 4494:23 4495: 21,22 4496:24 4500:7 4501:18 4506:24 4508:10.18 4509:24 4511:17,25 4513:5 4515:5,6,24 4516:2,4,19 4520:4 4521:5 4532: 18 4533:8 4537:22 4565:3,4 4567: 16 4568:1,3 4570:14,19,24 4576:1, 9,24 4577:19 4582:24 4592:16 4594:6,7 4604:23 pointed [4] 4437:4,5 4482:22 points [16] 4407:21,24 4409:17 4416:12 4432:20 4457:20,25 4469:12 4491:17 4552:8 4573:12 **4578:**9 **4580:**4 **4603:**23,24,25 polls [1] 4512:14 pool [5] 4506:24 4507:12 4514:5 4521:19 4551:22 Porter [1] 4401:8 portion [2] 4555:1 4564:15 position [9] 4428:17 4435:1 4476: 15,17 4477:22 4504:20 4541:23 4558:13 4601:11 positive [8] 4446:18 4480:18 4498: 20,21,23 4511:15 4516:4 4521:21 positively [1] 4576:22 possible [11] 4458:17 4470:2 4479:1 4505:21 4512:19,21 4514: 23,25 4520:16 4523:14,16 possibly [2] 4489:14 4513:7 potential [3] 4491:11 4522:21 4523:15 potentially [4] 4411:2 4467:2 4495:12 4496:14 pots [1] 4479:2 PowerPoint [1] 4478:19 practical [1] 4527:25 pre-test [1] 4474:20

precedence [1] 4418:15

precedent [11] 4408:9,15,20,21 4430:11 4448:24 4458:10 4488: 23,25 4489:19 4600:18 precise [3] 4462:25 4468:11 4578: precisely 3 4516:15 4518:1 4556: precision [1] 4446:15 predecessors [8] 4408:19,25 4412:17 4413:1 4421:11 4428:16 4438:25 4489:9 predict [1] 4544:4 predicted [4] 4464:25 4465:18 4545:6 4553:22 predicting [1] 4459:9 predictions [2] 4457:17 4549:12 predominant [3] 4538:8 4573:18, prefer [1] 4456:18 preference [2] 4514:21 4571:9 preferences [5] 4497:3 4503:16 4505:19,19 4566:18 premise [1] 4447:3 premised [1] 4484:7 premium [5] 4539:14,18 4544:3,7 4553:12 prepared [2] 4447:8 4471:24 prerogative [1] 4414:7 prescribe [1] 4536:4 prescribed [1] 4565:9 presence [1] 4521:13 present [5] 4421:1,1 4456:22 4528:14 4531:14 presentation [5] 4405:10 4478:19 4490:11 4508:11 4526:3 presented [32] 4412:11 4418:12 4424:16 4443:3,13,18 4444:18 4453:3 4454:3 4457:2,9 4458:15, 19 4461:16,19 4467:23 4468:13 4469:16 4505:12 4509:12 4510:2 4522:12 4528:21 4529:1 4531:1, 15,23 4533:10 4541:21 4545:5 4546:6 4574:18 presenting [3] 4478:8 4499:21 4505:21 presents [2] 4552:2 4586:25 pressed [1] 4554:1 prestigious [1] 4421:24 presumably [1] 4499:7 presume [1] 4557:10 presumed [1] 4562:12 presumes [2] 4558:18,21 pretty [4] 4420:15 4431:14 4440: 10 4501:18 previous [2] 4472:11 4534:10 previously [2] 4467:6 4509:14 price [3] 4494:12 4509:1 4536:5 primarily [2] 4429:8 4482:3 primary [11] 4410:22 4479:15 **4536**:18,19 **4537**:7,23 **4539**:6,7,19 4540:4 4542:20 prime [1] 4426:6

principal [5] 4441:10 4442:5 4444: 12 4445:3 4490:11 principle [5] 4409:8 4499:10 4593: 8 4601:5.6 prior [29] 4408:24 4409:1,1,9 4410: 5 4443:17 4445:19 4446:9 4448: 24 4453:4 4458:15,16 4461:7,10 4468:2,16 4488:21 4489:4,18,24, 25 4490:2,4,5 4521:3 4562:10 4578:20 4591:22 4600:13 prism [1] 4410:14 private [1] 4481:23 privilege [2] 4530:17 4571:6 pro [1] 4463:11 probable [1] 4508:6 probably [5] 4490:22,25 4510:19 4538:23 4541:23 probative [1] 4449:1 problem [13] 4453:20 4461:23 4468:16 4470:23 4472:20 4473: 20 4477:9 4508:3 4562:21 4563: 15 4568:3 4586:8 4593:14 problems [11] 4413:12 4434:8 4456:21 4471:15,25 4476:18,21 **4555:**8,13 **4556:**7 **4583:**5 proceeding [67] 4411:23,24 4412: 6,10,18 4413:10 4417:13,15,25 4421:5,12,22 4429:4,8,13 4437:5 **4441:**21 **4442:**20,22 **4443:**4,8,15 4445:1 4448:17 4455:7,9 4456:17 4464:10,24 4465:9 4466:4,16 4468:2,2 4469:16 4473:10 4475:2 4479:11 4485:11 4488:19 4531: 15,22 4532:6 4533:18 4541:21 4544:24,25 4546:12 4549:22 **4558:**7 **4563:**9 **4573:**10,13,17 **4574**:19 **4581**:17 **4591**:22 **4597**: 14 4598:24 4599:7 4600:4 4602: 17 4603:11,13,15 4605:21 4608:6 proceedings [36] 4408:10 4412: 20,23 4420:23 4424:25 4428:24, 25 4430:2 4433:19 4435:19 4438: 25 4439:13 4440:6,25 4460:4 4461:7 4466:2,24 4467:10,24 4468:14,20 4477:11,25 4480:19 4488:16 4490:3 4491:6 4533:21. 22 4559:11 4584:12,16 4585:18 4597:11 4599:24 process [4] 4443:24 4522:11 4547: 15 4569:6 produced [5] 4412:22 4445:16 4480:23 4522:7,9 produces [3] 4457:25 4458:2,4 producing [1] 4413:17 professional [1] 4435:23 Professor [1] 4444:18 Program [104] 4402:2 4407:22 **4412:**7 **4414:**2 **4417:**12 **4420:**25 **4426:**7 **4431:**8,19 **4432:**1,9,12,13 4435:3 4438:13 4441:15 4442:9 4446:17 4450:8 4451:25 4452:3,9, 24 4453:16 4454:1,3,22 4457:21

picking [1] 4566:2

picture [1] 4595:12

16 4458:12

pictures [3] 4503:4 4529:9,14

piece [5] 4412:5,19 4427:16 4444:

4458:1,10,21 4459:6,11,16,17 4461:25 4462:15 4470:8 4473:2 4483:14 4487:12 4497:11 4498: 20 4507:6 4510:12,13 4511:16,16 4516:11 4517:21 4521:20 4523: 25 4524:7 4525:14,23 4526:25 4527:6 4528:7,9 4530:14 4531:10, 12 4532:4.14.25 4534:12 4535:7 4538:5,5,12 4541:20 4542:19 4545:3,4,14,24,25 4546:2,3 4550: 13,16 4554:11 4555:3,4 4557:5 **4558**:9,19,22 **4563**:8 **4565**:24 4568:25 4570:5 4573:11 4574:5, 18,20 4575:12 4588:17 4589:2 **4590**:10 **4591**:18 **4599**:8,15 **4600**: programing [1] 4438:14

programmed [1] 4415:10 programming [171] 4408:3 4414: 20 4415:7,8,9,20,23,24,25 4416:4, 7,15 4417:4 4419:4 4420:9 4422: 14,19 4423:6,7 4424:1,14,19,20 **4426:**5,5,15,25 **4427:**5,18 **4429:**12 4431:6,7,8,13,20,22 4432:1,11,25 4433:7,12,13 4435:6,13 4436:8,23 4437:8,14,15 4439:24 4445:10 4447:4 4451:5 4456:1 4461:25 4466:18,25 4467:3,24 4472:21,23 **4473**:3,5 **4474**:10 **4475**:16,17,19 4477:1,6,8,14 4480:4 4481:16,22, 25 4482:19,20 4483:15,20 4484:9. 19 4485:23,25 4486:1,5,8 4492:15 4493:7 4494:22,25 4495:15,24 4496:1,17,20 4497:9,23 4499:4,7 **4503**:8,10,11 **4504**:7,10 **4507**:5 **4512**:3,23 **4513**:1,4 **4515**:13 **4518**: 8,9,10,11 4533:12 4535:4,5 4536: 9,24 4544:17,21 4545:7 4546:9 **4550:**13 **4551:**4,17 **4553:**10 **4554:** 16,24 4556:23 4559:15,22 4560:6, 10,18 4561:7,10,11 4563:4,5,7 **4565**:14 **4567**:24 **4571**:15,19 4573:8 4574:3,8 4576:12,19 4579: 2,5 4580:16,20,21,23,24 4581:9 4582:18 4584:18 4586:7,7,17 4590:2 4594:19 4598:1 4600:1,12 4602:16 4604:13,18 programs [41] 4431:17 4436:10 4451:9 4455:23 4459:15,19,24 4460:1 4462:6 4464:12 4469:22 4492:22 4495:2,5 4509:9 4513:25 4526:23 4527:10 4529:15,22,24 4530:4,10,18 4531:5,6 4533:13 **4534**:19 **4535**:18 **4536**:6 **4538**:25 4541:5,6 4544:8,19 4550:21 4551: 1,2 4572:19 4573:20 4574:4 prohibited [1] 4543:2 prohibiting [1] 4572:12

prominent [1] 4415:4 proper [1] 4509:7 properly [1] 4465:13 proponents [1] 4492:9 proportion [2] 4427:1 4576:20 propose [9] 4441:24 4456:13 4462:23 4469:5 4470:5,7 4477:25 4509:21 4522:17 proposed [26] 4408:17 4450:9 4454:4,5,24 4455:10,11 4465:23 4469:8 4470:9,13 4472:3,4 4475: 7 4481:7 4501:1 4509:15 4522:23, 24 4523:6 4540:1 4557:20 4579: 22,23 4594:8 4598:12 proposes [1] 4470:21 proposing [2] 4462:3 4469:25 proposition [1] 4543:18 Prospect [1] 4566:15 protected [5] 4529:11,20 4533:6,7 **4535:**5 protection [1] 4529:17 prove [1] 4465:3 provide [16] 4408:12 4441:5 4442: 14 4443:9 4444:7 4447:25 4451: 17 4457:3 4460:23 4465:14 4491: 7 4523:11 4570:4 4592:23 4593: 19.19 provided [7] 4441:1 4444:20 4454: 15.17 4463:25 4533:18 4594:21 provides [4] 4464:21 4466:8 4523: 13 4533:12 providing [2] 4423:13 4452:10 PTV [9] 4447:19,25 4517:4,9 4521: 20 4555:12 4592:3 4594:14 4596: PTV's [1] 4575:8 PTV-only [2] 4407:1 4466:17 Public [77] 4402:13 4406:25 4413: 21 4419:12 4435:15 4441:22 4458:5 4460:22 4461:11 4463:21 4464:5,7,11,15 4468:22 4469:17, 24 **4470**:10,12 **4471**:8,8,17 **4472**:6, 7,9,14,16,19,24 4473:3,8,22,24 4476:1,14 4478:25 4481:20 4482: 21 4483:5,21,24 4484:1,15 4485:2, 14 4491:14 4495:1 4516:12 4529: 12,21,23 4530:17 4531:18 4555: 11 **4566**:9 **4569**:13 **4578**:4,7 **4580**: 5,14,16,18,21,22 **458**1:4,8,13,25 4582:16,22 4583:2 4584:5,16,23 4595:16 4604:3,11 publicly [3] 4529:11 4530:9,15 published [2] 4509:14 4547:19 pull [1] 4430:11 pulling [1] 4495:8 pun [1] 4573:24 purchased [1] 4447:4 purchases [1] 4465:16 purely [1] 4410:8 purported [2] 4533:24 4558:22

purporting [2] 4527:23 4528:3

purports [1] 4457:3

purpose [7] 4434:1 4466:23 4519: 23 4541:3 4543:10,11 4549:14 purposes [2] 4532:15 4570:5 pushed [1] 4454:23 put [24] 4407:5 4410:4 4416:22 4417:13 4420:12 4426:11 4428: 18 4429:25 4430:21 4432:7 4435: 9 4441:15,18 4443:21 4467:22 4480:20 4482:23 4484:12 4491: 25 4517:24 4520:11 4550:18 4578:21 4603:6 puts [4] 4406:23 4407:9 4481:11 4489:16 putting [2] 4432:13 4434:4

Q quality [2] 4413;17 4522:25 quantifiable [1] 4603:8 quantified [1] 4550:24 quantify [2] 4543:22 4599:25 quantitative [8] 4441:10 4442:6 4444:13 4452:2 4543:21 4580:8 4581:21 4603:8 quarter [1] 4459:10 quarter-hour [3] 4545:7 4546:2 4553:23 quarter-hours [2] 4553:9,20 question [56] 4417:5 4419:23 4439:10 4446:24 4448:11,12,16, 19,20 4453:6,7,4459:7 4464:14,21 4469:1 4471:13 4474:20,24 4488: 17,18,24 4492:8 4493:1,4 4501:11

18,19 4505:4 4512:25 4517:16

4518:21 4523:8 4528:3,9 4540:7,

14 4545:1 4560:15 4561:20,21,25

4562:3,5 4569:10 4576:7 4577:23

4578:21,23 4583:7 4586:15 4593:

11 4595:22,23 4601:8,25 4602:13

questioning [1] 4556:19

questionnaire [2] 4554:13 4556: 16 questions [19] 4434:16 4455:20 4456:15 4463:17 4474:18,23 4478:3 4490:16,18 4491:2 4501: 13 4557:17 4561:16,20 4562:8,17 4564:14 4572:1 4595:1 quibble [1] 4568:16 quick [1] 4576:6 quickly [8] 4461:15 4516:1 4518: 19 4541:19 4554:2,3 4564:9,21

quite [7] 4410:5] 4484:22 4489:14 4518:12 4548:22 4573:11 4594: 10

quote | 17 | 4423:23 | 4430:23 | 4465: 25 | 4466:1,8 | 4492:5 | 4517:11 | quoted | 12 | 4588:16 | 4594:3 | quoting | 11 | 4429:21 |

R

race [1] 4437:12 radical [1] 4446:14 radio [1] 4587:25

quit [1] 4406:15

raised [5] 4439:12 4444:24 4523:7 4555:11 4578:19 ran [2] 4563:22 4564:4 random [1] 4545:8 range [3] 4427:13 4476:10 4574: rank [6] 4447:13 4566:12,21 4567: 12 4570:2.3 ranked [1] 4586:18 ranking [8] 4561:21 4565:23 4566: 17 4567:9 4569:12 4570:11,20 4571:6 rata [1] 4463:11 ratchet [1] 4411:16 rate [5] 4418:1,5,6,9 4524:4 rather [8] 4445:11 4446:25 4450: 10 4459:9 4489:15 4490:16 4536: ratings [11] 4422:24,24 4452:11 4542:1 4574:21 4580:14 4581:15, 16 4582:6 4587:21 4588:1 ratio [1] 4419:21 rational [5] 4565:23 4568:10 4569: 6.7.8 rationale [1] 4570:22 rationality [1] 4570:3 ratios [4] 4420:14 4424:21 4425: 25 4428:10 raw [2] 4409:4 4454:16 reach [1] 4604:15 reached [1] 4461:13 reaching [1] 4431:2 read [4] 4493:16 4585:23 4597:21 4600:17 readily [1] 4606:5 real [5] 4413:12 4416:14 4424:24 4525:13 4598:16 reality [9] 4477:17 4580:20 4582:8, 9 4603:20,21 4604:8,9,21 realize [1] 4434:5 really [41] 4408:8 4415:3 4417:10 4421:8 4424:1 4425:12 4431:25 4435:24 4466:15 4477:3 4484:13 4486:8 4489:12 4495:21 4503:10, 25 4509:24 4511:25 4512:8 4513: 9 4535:2 4540:10,12 4541:18 4542:19 4543:2 4545:11,15 4554: 2 4561:2 4564:21 4569:17 4581:3 **4583:**8 **4596:**22 **4598:**7,13,22 4599:4 4601:22 4602:7 realm [2] 4452:12 4538:17 reason [11] 4433:24 4456:4 4459: 17 4497:4 4505:21 4519:9 4540: 21,23 4550:22 4590:3 4597:20 reasonable [9] 4491:5 4499:12 4517:6,13 4523:12,13 4536:14 4548:5 4592:14 reasonableness [5] 4430:24 4455:1 4477:18 4552:3 4594:1 reasonably [2] 4457:4 4580:7 reasoned [1] 4601:17 reasoning [3] 4409:11 4491:25

prohibition [1] 4543:8

projected [1] 4457:14

projection [4] 4459:1

project [2] 4433:6 4477:20

4493:1 reasons [8] 4433:19 4435:3 4467: 16 4512:10 4541:16 4555:18 4581:12 4582:15 rebroadcast [1] 4507:3 rebut [1] 4524:15 rebuttable [2] 4440:17 4449:16 rebuttal [26] 4405:16 4417:8 4450: 15 4464:1,3 4478:4,13 4487:7 4492:12 4523:22 4524:8,9 4525:7, 16 4572:10,14,15 4575:20,22 4576:3 4578:6 4580:4 4586:1,25 4596:13 4607:9 recall [9] 4413:3 4511:1,3,9 4527: 17 4537:22 4556:12 4560:13 **4564:**9 recalling [1] 4511:9 receipt [3] 4494:20 4498:25 4575: receipts [11] 4494:14,17 4505:11, 14,25 4506:1,9,21 4507:11 4508: 13 4514:3 receive [2] 4469:19 4486:14 receives [1] 4469:14 receiving [2] 4532:5 4582:21 recent [2] 4411:14 4442:21 recently [1] 4418:4 recess [6] 4463:20,22 4487:11,14 4524:5.23 reckoning [1] 4523:21 recognition [1] 4482:11 recognize [1] 4437:19 recognized [2] 4426:14 4461:23 recollection [2] 4511:5 4521:24 recommended [1] 4547:1 recommending [1] 4594:17 record [53] 4406:20 4408:1,5,6,8 4409:17,18 4410:9,10 4412:5,15, 19,24 4413:4 4414:18 4417:14 4425:7 4428:18 4430:5,5 4432:17 4439:3 4442:11.13 4443:21 4448: 23 4458:12 4462:4 4464:18 4468: 23 4471:18 4490:3 4509:11 4511: 7 4522:14,15 4525:4 4528:18 4556:2 4574:19 4579:25 4580:9, 14 4581:14 4586:22 4589:21 4594:22 4600:24 4601:16,18 4602:14 4603:14 4604:8 recorded [1] 4553:14 records [3] 4425:8 4433:15 4434: 14 recoup [1] 4539:17 red [1] 4423:8 reemphasize [1] 4488:13 refer [2] 4579:22 4589:18 reference [4] 4552:3,8,11 4556:22 references [1] 4529:14 referred [5] 4426:25 4522:4 4550: 11 4588:3.17 referring [5] 4422:10,11 4499:17 4511:10 4587:6 reflect [4] 4451:13 4463:14 4511:

18 4602:15 reflected [3] 4582:3,22 4583:24 reflects [4] 4434:6 4497:22 4511: 20.24 reformulate [1] 4589:7 reformulated [2] 4571:22 4589:4 reformulation [1] 4564:22 Refresh [1] 4521:23 regard [22] 4410:1 4417:1,2 4425: 21 4476:17 4491:16 4541:5 4546: 25 4550:12,15 4554:7 4556:15,25, 25 4561:17 4562:14 4564:9,20 4568:25 4571:9 4579:19 4586:22 regarding [3] 4405:9 4467:8 4576: regardless [3] 4449:10 4584:15 4603:5 region [1] 4482:4 regional [1] 4509:18 regionally [2] 4433:12 4474:12 Register [3] 4489:21 4539:24 4592:9 regression [106] 4407:5,8 4426:21. 22 4428:22,22 4441:13 4442:9 4443:2.17 4444:14.18 4445:7.18 **4446**:5,14,16,21 **4447**:1,7,9,20 4448:3,5,25 4450:5,11,20 4451:3 **4463:**6 **4464:**20 **4465:**2,8,13,20 4466:8 4467:14 4468:13 4471:19 4477:23 4479:21 4480:14.15 4486:20 4496:6.9 4497:21 4498:9 4500:2 4504:1,2 4505:7 4506:7,8, 14,16,25 4509:9 4514:20 4516:3 **4517:**24 **4518:**4,6 **4519:**13,16,18 **4520:**7 **4521:**3,18,22 **4528:**25 4545:6,18,22 4546:7,4549:10,14, 16 4550:2 4565:7 4567:18 4575:1 **4576**:15 **4577**:2 **4578**:9,14,18,24 4579:21 4581:22 4582:3 4583:25 **4589:**5,8,15 **4590:**1,8,17 **4591:**7 4592:4 4593:5 4594:11,12,13,14, regression-based [1] 4457:15 regressions [30] 4426:21 4430:7 4439:16 4445:20 4446:9,23 4449: 5 4476:5 4490:14 4491:16 4492:5, 6.10 4495:6.18 4499:22 4508:3.5. 9,15 4513:23 4515:23 4519:10 4520:8 4522:5,12 4574:9 4579:9 4590:7 4593:3 regular [2] 4563:3 4573:2 regulated [2] 4425:21 4534:4 regulatorily [1] 4565:9 regulatory [3] 4543:6 4558:20 4574:11 reinvent [1] 4490:8 reject [2] 4453:17 4519:8 rejected [4] 4520:9 4522:10 4588: 14 4599:15 rejecting [1] 4456:23 relate [2] 4519:3,4 related [1] 4591:14

relates [3] 4422:3 4426:18 4488: relating [2] 4488:19 4509:13 relationship [10] 4412:12,13 4414: 4 4420:10 4421:25 4423:5 4425:1, 9 4530:22 4545:23 relative [77] 4406:21 4408:2,3,6,7, 12 4409:5.20.21.21.22 4410:2 4413:20 4414:14.14 4416:9,11.14 4424:13,23 4447:13,14 4448:1 4449:1 4452:22 4453:1,2 4454:10 4456:12,14 4464:11 4465:4,5 4466:1,5,24 4471:6 4484:14 4504: 21 4505:6 4508:12,17 4510:13,21 **4512:**15,18 **4514:**1 **4527:**5,13,21, 23 4528:12 4530:24 4533:10.23 4535:17 4541:4 4558:8.11.15.17. 19.25 4559:16 4560:5,9 4567:13 4569:21,24 4574:7 4579:8,10 4586:12 4590:9 4591:16 4597:25 4601:23 relatively [3] 4432:4 4449:6 4455: relevant [6] 4417:17 4453:6.10 4456:25 4477:10 4536:14 reliability [1] 4556:11 reliable [12] 4443:10 4444:10 4445:6 4454:7,9,20 4466:9 4471: 20 4491:5 4492:7 4550:10 4561: reliance [1] 4551:24 reliant [1] 4411:14 relic [1] 4551:15 relied [7] 4418:1,8 4461:6 4544:16 4546:7,13 4574:10 relieve [1] 4488:5 religiosity [3] 4512:15,18 4589:25 rely [11] 4430:21 4441:11 4460:23 4533:24 4541:15 4551:25 4552:5, 19 4581:15,20,23 relying [2] 4592:13 4599:2 remainder [1] 4481:6 remained [1] 4432:4 remaining 3 4478:4 4492:11 4575:15 remains [2] 4481:12 4573:1 remarkable [2] 4423:15 4448:13 remarkably [2] 4447:10 4583:25 remember [14] 4411:25 4417:24 4439:7 4445:23 4455:21 4466:22 4472:25 4475:20 4494:11 4506:5 4509:10 4511:18 4578:11 4604: 14 remembering [1] 4510:24 reminding [1] 4554:14 remove [5] 4519:23,24 4531:25 4532:10 4576:13 renders [1] 4453:22 reorganize [1] 4532:21 rephrase [1] 4550:5 replace [1] 4463:10 replaced [3] 4438:8,10 4457:16

replacement [1] 4543:15 replacing [1] 4458:25 replicate [1] 4591:10 replicated [1] 4450:4 replicating 2 4468:20 4519:22 report [8] 4431:12,23 4469:9 4539: 24 4552:20 4597:12 4599:12 4606:4 Reported [6] 4400:23 4454:9 4455:25 4458:8 4459:17 4591:25 reporter [3] 4488:4 4608:10,13 reporters [3] 4488:7 4523:23 4524.6 reporting [1] 4457:23 reports [1] 4457:16 represent [4] 4526:13.19 4527:23 4555:17 representations [1] 4605:25 representative [1] 4437:22 representatives [1] 4557:14 represented [3] 4406:8 4459:14 4562:13 representing [1] 4504:21 represents [1] 4550:1 reputation [1] 4413:17 request [2] 4487:8 4584:23 require [3] 4466:19 4470:14 4573: required [2] 4480:21 4570:18 requirements [1] 4489:17 requires [1] 4490:4 rescue [1] 4470:16 rescued [2] 4469:2.3 rescuing [1] 4470:25 research [8] 4413:15,18 4421:23 4423:23 4437:21 4541:9,10 4587: reserve [6] 4440:16,18 4464:1 4478:3.12 4525:7 reserved [2] 4524:9 4585:8 reserving [2] 4405:15 4487:6 resides [1] 4571:16 resolved [1] 4433:21 resources [2] 4479:18,20 respect [15] 4428:25 4430:2 4436: 18 4445:7 4447:13,16,18 4516:11 **4528**:19 **4560**:3 **4561**:9 **4562**:12 4576:24 4588:21 4593:13 respectfully [1] 4584:22 respond [4] 4449:12 4524:14 4564:13 4597:3 respondent [2] 4472:24 4559:21 respondents [28] 4435:13 4436: 22,25 4437:1,6 4438:9,19 4474:14, 22 4475:9,15,21,25 4477:4 4554: 15 4557:4,15 4559:15 4561:4,18, 22 4562:1,3,5,17,22 4563:19 4564: respondents' [3] 4554:14 4556: 22 4564:1 responding [5] 4483:4 4557:16 4561:4,19 4589:17

response [19] 4429:19 4439:12 4454:24 4455:19 4456:5 4461:16 4463:16 4468:25 4470:25 4481:1 4501:1 4549:24 4559:24 4560:14, 16 4563:18 4579:24 4585:24 4589:18 responses [11] 4408:18 4455:11 4475:3.6.14 4481:10.10 4517:10 4561:24 4563:22 4564:1 responsible [3] 4474:15 4506:22 4587:18 responsive [1] 4436:5 rest [7] 4460:16 4463:9 4587:2 4590:25 4594:8 4604:17 4606:6 restrictions [1] 4419:16 result [6] 4429:18 4445:3.12 4480: 16 4516:20 4518:18 resulted [1] 4588:25 results [59] 4426:19,20 4428:20 4436:19 4438:11 4439:1 4440:4, 11 4443:2 4446:16,17,21,23 4447: 10 4448:21 4449:6 4450:6.19 4451:1 4455:18 4459:5 4470:22 4480:24 4481:8 4485:19 4486:11 4487:1 4491:24 4503:25 4509:25 4518:14 4519:13,13,19 4520:9,16, 18,19,23,24 4521:22 4522:18,19 **4523**:11,12,15 **4531**:14 **4545**:15 4546:5 4552:2 4555:4 4564:6,7,7, 23 4575:1 4579:17 4589:1.9 resumed [3] 4463:23 4487:15 4524:24 retaining [2] 4449:24 4570:6 retains [1] 4572:23 retention [1] 4542:15 retransmission [10] 4417:4 4505: 16 4529:19 4537:4,10,21 4538:15 4539:10 4557:25 4573:21 retransmissions [1] 4582:20 retransmit [14] 4492:15 4493:6,6 4496:3 4499:8 4503:9,12 4508:7, 25 4512:11 4534:15,18 4539:11 4579:1 retransmitted [13] 4449:12 4467: 1 4479:24 4495:25 4497:2 4504: 13,15 4508:5 4527:10 4530:19 4536:5 4543:16 4587:7 retransmitting [13] 4492:22,24 4494:21 4495:4 4497:17 4499:1,3 **4505**:1 **4511**:15 **4512**:2,6 **4515**:12 **4576**:18 return [1] 4487:13 revealed [2] 4514:21,22 revenue [2] 4425:18 4543:17 revenues [1] 4587:2 reverse [3] 4575:21 4577:24 4585: 14 review [3] 4409:25 4410:8 4503: richer [1] 4465:14 ridiculous [1] 4581:2

12 4531:10 4536:21 4537:4,7,23 4539:10 4542:19 rightsholders [1] 4526:16 rips [1] 4547:6 ROBERT [2] 4401:3 4402:16 Robles [1] 4403:11 robust [5] 4471:20 4491:5 4492:7 4549:17 4553:7 Rogers [7] 4584:7.10 4585:18 4595:3,8,13 4596:11 Rogers' [1] 4584:4 rolling [1] 4587:15 rollout [1] 4587:23 Ron [1] 4464:7 RONALD [1] 4402:14 room [1] 4585:16 Rosston [1] 4465:2 rough [1] 4447:16 roughly [1] 4415:10 route [2] 4470:11 4598:14 royalties [24] 4419:14 4424:3,10 4445:14 4447:6 4451:7,10,15 4472:18 4479:2 4493:19,21,25 4494:1,3 4506:23 4514:3,5 4527: 5 4540:12 4558:16 4582:21 4591: 15 4596:20 ROYALTY [18] 4400:1,7 4410:16, 23 4416:5 4417:25 4435:14 4486: 3,15 4489:3 4507:12 4518:16 4536:4 4551:14 4553:12 4558:4 4574:20 4591:10 RPR [1] 4400:23 ruling [2] 4409:1 4411:6 rulings [4] 4408:24 4409:2 4420: 21 4430:17 run [1] 4426:9 running [1] 4488:5 runs [1] 4481:14

S S.E [1] 4400:15 salvageable [1] 4471:14 same [50] 4411:3,4 4415:18 4418: 9 4419:15,15,16 4422:11,22 4423: 14,17 4426:22 4427:1 4440:8 4442:19 4444:6,16 4446:24 4447: 15,17 4448:7,11,12 4450:19 4455: 13 **4475:**14,16 **4476:**23 **4481:**18 4484:3,13,17 4516:16,20 4517:24 4525:17 4538:22 4557:23 4558:1 4561:16 4564:5 4566:19 4579:17 4581:5 4583:5 4590:11.12 4591:5 4598:20 4603:9 sample [11] 4433:5,10,25 4445:11 4459:18,20 4485:15 4545:8 4550: 8 4551:22 4587:16 sampled [1] 4553:7 samples [1] 4473:2 sampling [1] 4547:25 Sanders [1] 4544:17 Sanders' [1] 4512:13 sat [1] 4596:4 satellite [3] 4418:5 4440:1 4602:

SATTERFIELD [10] 4403:3,4 4478:10,11,14,16,17 4552:22 4578:1 4607:6 Saunders' [1] 4526:14 save [2] 4412:6 4440:13 saved [1] 4585:11 saw [6] 4414:23 4448:7 4470:23 4475:2.8.13 saving [43] 4408:15 4409:6,24 4410:3 4411:15 4412:14 4414:9 4417:9 4425:15 4427:3,14 4437: 12 4493:18 4497:7,9 4498:1,5 4499:19 4502:15 4508:12,19,22 4509:10 4513:3 4515:9 4518:21 4520:12.20 4521:24 4525:25 4532:2:15 4560:12 4579:3.4 4581: 15'4586:11'4594:7 4595:6 4598:7 4600:16 4601:18 4603:14 says [24] 4408:23 4418:23 4422:17 4423:10,11,4429:12,4430:25 4434:9 4458:11 4489:2,2 4498:7. 9,12 4499:21 4517:20 4557:22 4558:4 14 4560:23 4589:16 4593: 15 4597:22 4602:6 scenes [1] 4582:2 schedule [1] 4525:14 scheme [5] 4535:9 4539:15 4540: 10 4551:15 4574:11 Scholer [1] 4401:8 Schwartz [1] 4405:25 science [1] 4584:19 scientific [1] 4523:5 screen [2] 4574:23 4578:22 SDC [3] 4488:15 4544:17,22 SEAN [1] 4401:4 seated [1] 4524:25 Second [19] 4408:4 4422:4 4423: 22 4445:12 4450:24 4468:4 4472: 17:4474:2 4490;3 4492:2 4495:20 4498:11 4536:25 4537:13 4548: 18 4562:18,19 4568:19 4569:11 secondary [5] 4536:19 4537:8,17 4539:4.16 Secondly [2] 4450:3 4495:21 Section [30] 4418:7 4489:5 4527: 11 4529:5,6,13,18 4530:1,6,11,12, 23 4531:9 4532:17 4533:25 4534: 17 4536:3,23 4538:23 4539:24 4543:2 4557:24 4558:1,20 4562:2, 3 4 6 4565:1 4594:2 Sections [1] 4531:9 see [50] 4409:19 4415:6,20 4419: 18'**4420:**13,17 **4424**:15,20,21 4425:25 4426:15 4427:24 4428:3, 3,4,10 4431:10,12,24 4433:14 4438:19 4441:6 4448:3 4449:17. 19 4457:17,21 4458:20 4462:11, 12 4473:10 4477:9 4488:2 4498: 22'4502:12'4507:1 4512:16 4521: 2,7 4524:17,19 4537:12 4552:20 4568:24 4584:7 4591:23 4598:19

4604:8,19 4605:23 seeing [2] 4450:15 4605:9 seek [1] 4539:17 seeking [1] 4542:6 seem [2] 4448:18 4592:4 seems [1] 4527:18 seen [4] 4466:13 4477:24 4488:11 seament [2] 4481:14 4486:1 select [4] 4426:13 4445:23 4520: 18 4544:20 selected [5] 4433:10 4509:10 4520:7 4544:21 4545:9 selecting [4] 4520:18 4542:11,13 4566:19 selection [3] 4492:3 4510:12 4522:11 sell [1] 4536:13 seller [1] 4559:12 sellers [3] 4424:17 4536:8,12 sellers' [2] 4598:5,17 selling [2] 4527:9 4542:1 sense [20] 4422:11 4425:16 4428: 20 4433:4 4440:4 4448:4 4475:18 4485:10 4491:10 4504:8,11,17 4540:2 4555:22,23 4565:18 4567: 13 4581:24 4592:17,25 sensitive [2] 4519:19 4520:17 sensitivity [8] 4492:3 4521:11,12, 25 **4522:**1,3,15 **4591:**20 sent [1] 4595:12 sentence [1] 4597:22 separate [3] 4410:19 4437:8 4473: 20 seriously [1] 4444:1 **SESSION** [1] 4607:15 set [9] 4411:4,4 4419:15 4452:2 4464:16 4525:14 4540:10 4558: 11 4606:2 settlement [1] 4606:4 Settling 4 4403:15 4404:2 4488: 9 4576:4 seven [1] 4553:24 Seventeenth [1] 4404:7 several [8] 4412:20 4413:24 4435: 19 4443:20 4541:15 4542:10 4556:7 4563:4 Shagrin [4] 4458:23 4546:21 4548: 4 4587:13 shall [1] 4408:23 share [45] 4406:24 4407:2.6.17 4415:17 4416:16 4427:25 4428:6. 8 4432:14,15 4443:6 4448:5 4457: 19 4458:4,6 4463:6,6,8 4464:16 4469:14,15,17,19,23 4470:2,6,9, 13 4473:8,14,14,17 4476:16 4498: 6 4573:12 4580:6 4581:13 4582: 23 4583:4 4588:7,12 4594:9,14 4596:20 shares [30] 4422:3 4447:14,16,19, 19,20 4454:10,19,20 4461:19 4462:21 4464:22 4467:17 4469:5,

rights [12] 4529:8,10,22,25 4530:

9.11.13 4470:4 4471:9 4476:3,6,9 4498:4,9 4516:23 4517:5,25 4584: 24 4589:11 4594:8 Shaw [1] 4404:6 shelf [1] 4541:25 shift [3] 4446:3 4516:8 4517:3 short [4] 4438:20 4491:22 4533:14 4563:13 shortcomings [1] 4592:12 shorthand [1] 4452:10 shorthands [1] 4586:10 shot [1] 4587:12 shouldn't [1] 4467:3 show [16] 4406:21 4412:8,11 4417: 10 4418:17 4422:20,21 4426:22 4432:3,18 4459:5 4460:13 4463:5 4489:7 4499:20 4595:25 showed [9] 4455:21 4457:10 4521 12 4588:25 4589:22,25 4590:22 4591:6,9 showing [6] 4409:20 4414:13 4417:17 4420:1 4514:20 4603:22 shows [20] 4407:23 4408:6 4409: 23 4415:1 4420:7 4421:21 4423:4 4426:18 4428:19 4431:25 4462:5. 7 4471:18 4476:3 4494:10 4512: 14 4522:25 4578:22 4601:1 4602: 14 Shum [1] 4467:12 sick [1] 4596:2 side [17] 4414:8.9 4434:13 4462: 18 4463:1 4476:24 4556:17 4559: 9 4597:24,25 4598:5,8,17,17,18, 22 4599:1 sidekick [1] 4595:24 signal [43] 4415:5 4424:4 4427:19 4428:6 4431:2,4 4436:13,16 4437: 3 4438:10 4445:10,13,22 4447:4 4449:11 4451:4 4455:24 4459:11 4473:4 4475:12 4485:25 4486:7 **4496**:21,22 **4505**:22 **4507**:4,4,25 4529:20 4537:11,21 4538:4 4539: 11 4542:11,13 4548:25 4556:23 4561:6 4563:2 4571:14 4574:7 4582:15 4604:14 signals [43] 4435:14,15 4445:24, 25 4447:25,25 4449:20,20 4450: 23 4451:5,22 4467:1,25 4474:8 4478:24 4479:23 4480:4,10,12 4482:19,20 4484:10 4485:23 4486:2,10 4504:5 4507:24 4508:4 4516:17 4518:4 4531:6,7,20 4535: 24 4536:1 4554:13 4559:23 4560: 6,11 4563:1,1,7 4590:14 signature [3] 4436:7 4608:10,13 significance [2] 4543:24 4598:14 significant [10] 4415:3 4419:8 4446:19 4455:13 4516:5,13 4521: 16,22 4530:6 4598:18 significantly [2] 4469:18 4580:6 Silberberg [1] 4402:8

10.10 4448:14 4465:3 4502:8 4577:2 4589:10 4590:12 simple 3 4527:14,16 4590:17 simplistic [1] 4590:17 simply [21] 4409:8 4428:5 4429:2 4437:23 4450:7 4453:6,19 4454: 11 4459:19 4461:8 4463:4 4491: 24 4492:7 4494:13 4496:24 4515: 8 4516:18 4549:19 4579:15 4589: 11 4590:20 since [5] 4429:13 4456:16 4488:11 4499:7 4566:4 single [13] 4412:4,18 4434:7 4458: 3,5 4459:10,11,11 4492:25 4512: 20 4572:24 4577:4 4592:10 sit [1] 4463:17 sitting [1] 4468:19 situated [1] 4567:21 situation [4] 4480:7 4481:12 4482: 12 4484:8 situations [1] 4590:12 six [4] 4447:15 4466:3 4580:23 4593:15 size [7] 4422:13 4506:2,2,21 4551: 16.16 4590:13 skewed [1] 4593:21 skill [1] 4608:4 skip [3] 4460:18,19 4488:12 slide [50] 4414:15,22 4415:1 4421: 18 4423:9 4427:16 4430:12 4431: 10 4432:2 4434:24 4438:1,23 4461:1,17,21 4462:7,17,22 4463: 12 4469:11 4471:24 4473:11 4476:2 4488:12 4490:11 4492:8 4493:3 4494:8 4497:18 4498:22 **4501:**5,9,10 **4503:**22 **4512:**12 4516:2,15,21 4517:11 4518:20 4534:5,10 4537:12,18 4556:9 4557:19 4559:18 4562:19,24 4591:5 slides [5] 4420:12 4432:19 4466: 14 4490:15,17 slightly [1] 4469:23 sliver [1] 4543:15 slope [6] 4498:14 4499:22,22 4500:1,3,8 sloping [4] 4495:7 4497:12 4498: 20.23 slots [1] 4544:20 small [8] 4426:4 4437:10 4455:3 4482:3 4485:22 4549:6 4551:3 4592:14 smaller [3] 4445:15 4458:1 4594: 15 smallest [1] 4479:19 so-called [7] 4442:10 4452:4,7 4455:7 4516:17 4518:4 4553:14 solid [1] 4413:17 solutions [1] 4520:16 solved [2] 4468:15,17 somehow [4] 4470:16 4483:3 4543:1 4551:21

someone [3] 4439:23,25 4486:2 somewhat [5] 4458:1 4470:20 4482:12 4514:13 4594:14 somewhere [1] 4427:8 son [2] 4595:7,10 sorry [6] 4449:3 4503:9 4529:23 4550:5 4564:16 4588:11 sort [24] 4418:21 4419:25 4447:21 4477:17 4482:9 4488:3 4512:24 4525:16 4526:7 4532:3 4534:14 4538:7,13,16,24 4539:15 4541:19 4543:18 4548:23 4551:20 4581: 19 4582:7 4589:20 4598:2 sorted [1] 4524:6 sounds [1] 4527:14 sources [1] 4546:8 sparse [2] 4549:4,9 speaker [1] 4525:5 speaking [2] 4482:6 4487:4 speaks [1] 4540:15 special [2] 4473:6 4495:1 specific [4] 4459:24 4549:22 4555: 12 4594:22 specifically [4] 4489:7 4544:4 4554:22 4556:21 speculate [1] 4523:11 speed [1] 4555:7 spend [6] 4490:14,22 4491:1 4526: 12 4554:3.5 spent [8] 4412:7 4415:22 4430:13 4456:15,16 4479:3 4595:8 4596:1 spin [1] 4589:14 split [1] 4519:12 spoke [1] 4540:22 spoken [3] 4540:19 4593:10 4597: spokesperson [2] 4405:13 4440: Sports [57] 4401:2 4405:11,21,23 4406:22 4407:4,6,9,16 4415:13 **4423:**5,7,13,15 **4426:**1 **4427:**8,12 4435:5,19,24 4436:22 4437:7,13, 17 4438:4 4443:22 4469:21 4470: 3 4471:4 4475:15 4476:6,8 4483: 13 4484:23 4496:3,4 4507:8 4513: 5,8 4514:1 4518:17 4521:14 4535: 8 4554:11,24 4555:2,6 4556:2,6 4557:21 4568:12,17,18 4582:24 4596:13 4603:23 4604:2 Sports' [1] 4407:2 squared [2] 4563:24 4591:12 Squire [1] 4401:14 stack [1] 4528:4 stamps [1] 4561:23 stand [1] 4559:19 standard [13] 4457:1 4461:7,14 4499:15 4527:4.13.16.21 4528:4. 13 4530:24 4558:15,25 standards [1] 4533:23 standpoint [1] 4480:3 stare [1] 4489:1

start [8] 4406:18 4414:22 4484:13

4486:19 4529:4,5 **4556:**6 **4595:**15 started [4] 4439:1 4440:7 4483:11 4499:3 starting [2] 4442:23,25 Stata [2] 4421:19 4423:4 state [3] 4466:7.10 4590:11 stated [2] 4465:9 4573:4 Statement [3] 4442:1 4527:18 4590:18 STATES [3] 4400:1 4423:2 4482:4 station [25] 4481:21 4482:1 4483: 6,6,18,24 4504:17 4508:8,8 4509: 1,17 4510:17 4511:20 4530:2,5,19 4538:13,18 4542:18 4545:8 4546: 1 4563:3 4568:7,13,18 station-only [1] 4485:14 station-produced [1] 4526:23 stations [43] 4454:7 4456:9 4459: 18,20 **4460:**10 **4472:**19 **4478:**25 4479:1 4481:18,19 4482:2,2,8 4483:9,10,16,20,21 4484:2,15,16, 17 4485:2.3 4513:25 4530:10 4538:15,16 4543:16 4545:8 4550: 3,5,8 **4551:**22 **4553:**8,23 **4561:**10 **4565**:24 **4566**:19 **4567**:7 **4569**:3 4570:4 4571:4 statistical [1] 4520:12 statistically [7] 4446:18 4516:5, 13 4521:14,15,21 4523:1 Statisticians [1] 4520:10 statistics [1] 4563:23 statute [6] 4408:22 4488:20 4489: 2,2,15 4606:3 statutorily [1] 4536:4 statutory [4] 4490:7 4530:16 4565: 5 4606:7 stay [3] 4413:13 4506:19 4544:12 Stec [3] 4556:12 4563:16,17 Steckel [4] 4467:12 4556:11 4562: 15 4563:14 STELA [2] 4445:12 4482:25 stemmed [1] 4465:10 stenographic [1] 4608:5 step [1] 4483:7 steps [1] 4441:24 **STERNBERG** [1] 4403:17 STEWART [27] 4401:19 4440:14, 18.22 4449:14 4463:19 4467:18 4468:6 4470:23 4517:19 4524:11 **4526**:8 **4552**:21 **4585**:8,9,12 **4586**: 3 4587:9 4593:4,10 4594:4,25 **4595**:5 **4596**:6,9 **4607**:4,12 Stewart's [1] 4519:11 stick [1] 4568:17 still [33] 4409:9 4438:19 4451:21 4469:21 4472:22 4473:17 4475: 22 4477:10 4481:2 4482:6 4489: 23 4498:2,13 4511:12,14 4533:1 **4538**:3,24 **4544**:9 **4553**:5 **4557**:3 **4558**:21 **4562**:2,6 **4565**:3,22 **4567**: 6,8 4568:10 4570:2,3 4598:20 4602:13

similar [10] 4420:13 4435:9 4447:

stone [1] 4490:6 stop [1] 4521:7 story [1] 4452:1 straightforward [1] 4447:2 strange [1] 4592:5 stream [1] 4535:20 Street [6] 4401:15 4402:9.19 4403: 5.19 4404:7 Strickland [3] 4400:23 4488:5 4608:9 STRICKLER [83] 4400:11 4406:14 4408:14 4409:6,24 4411:7 4416: 25 4425:10 4448:16 4449:3 4469: 1 4493:9 4495:16 4496:5,8 4497: 20 4499:9,14,24 4500:12,20,25 **4501**:8,17,22 **4502**:1,7,11,19,23 4503:20 4504:19 4505:4,24 4506: 10,19 4507:18 4508:10 4509:2,6 **4510**:7 **4511**:5 **4512**:24 **4513**:11 4521:23 4522:6.13 4524:21 4532: 2.12 4537:12.15 4543:12 4547:6 4565:19 4566:8 4567:2 4568:2.16 4569:21,24 4570:24 4572:2 4576: 7,10 4577:10 4581:10 4582:7,13 **4583:**15 **4587:**5 **4593:**2,6,24 **4595**: 2 4596:8 4600:14 4601:4,10 4602: 19,24 4603:2,5 Strickler's [2] 4488:18,24 strictly [1] 4604:24 strike [1] 4456:18 striking [4] 4438:4 4567:21,25 4570:14 strip [1] 4479:24 stronger [3] 4413:4 4444:10 4445: strongly [1] 4453:3 struck [1] 4455:6 structure [5] 4479:7 4534:2 4535: 13 4558:21 4597:23 structures [1] 4534:3 studied [2] 4445:9 4544:3 studies [20] 4406:19 4421:1 4438: 6,17 4441:10 4442:13,14 4443:12 4444:3,13 4448:8 4453:18 4460: 23 4463:8 4466:14,16 4477:20 4580:8 4581:21 4604:1 study [55] 4407:20,22,25 4412:4 4414:24 4426:19,20 4427:17 4428:21 4430:6 4441:18 4442:10 4443:2,19 4444:13,22 4452:4,21 4453:5.23 4454:2.21 4456:19.20. 23 4457:2.6 4458:13 4459:25 4461:6 4462:9,25 4463:1 4466:13, 14,15,20 4468:18 4470:8 4476:18, 19,22 4477:12 4480:20 4482:14, 15 4484:12,21,24 4490:23 4517: 22 4544:10 4567:21 4591:24 4592:1 stuff [1] 4454:16 sub-licensing [1] 4539:25 subgroup [6] 4450:16 4451:3,8,10, 10,16

subgroup-based [1] 4450:11 subgroup-by-subgroup [1] 4451:23 subgrouping [1] 4482:25 subgroups [6] 4445:15 4446:4 4449:18.19 4451:18 4590:11 subject [5] 4490:19.19 4557:25 4558:5 4573:21 subjective [2] 4493:12,14 submit [7] 4465:17 4492:13 4517: 23 4543:24 4580:11 4581:2 4583: submitted [1] 4557:21 subscriber [29] 4445:14,17 4468; 5 4474:7 4492:14 4493:5,23 4494: 2 4495:12,14 4496:19 4506:3,11 4511:21,22 4512:22 4542:15 **4553**:22 **4573**:8 **4577**:4,12,18,21 4578:15,25 4579:7 4587:2 4589:9 4590:10 subscribers [27] 4431:3 4449:24. 25 4451:6 4483:25 4484:1,2,3 4486:14 4493:13,15 4495:11 4505:9 4514:11 4518:23.24 4519: 3,4,6,17 4544:5,11 4546:1 4570:7 4572:23 4573:6 4604:16 subscribership [2] 4544:13 4566: substantial [6] 4444:10 4445:21 4446:2 4462:16 4481:24 4588:23 substantially [3] 4443:19 4486:16 4604:7 substitute [1] 4458:7 substituted [1] 4554:16 subsumed [1] 4513:17 suck [1] 4591:13 suddenly [1] 4483:1 sufficient [1] 4459:6 sufficiently [2] 4425:17,19 suggest [6] 4428:15 4436:21 4455: 11 4462:18 4463:7 4494:4 suggested [1] 4442:17 suggesting [2] 4429:1 4590:1 suggestion [1] 4519:12 suggests [2] 4452:20 4505:7 Suite [3] 4403:5,11,19 suited [1] 4466:1 sum [4] 4448:1 4474:19 4482:17 4593-15 summarize [3] 4467:19 4472:5 4475:8 summary [4] 4438:14 4469:11 4560:22.23 superior [3] 4465:22 4467:8 4468: superstation [1] 4415:4 superstations [1] 4480:11 Suppliers [50] 4402:2 4412:7 4417:12 4420:25 4426:7 4432:9 4441:15 4452:1,3,9 4454:1,3,22 4457:21 4458:1,10,21 4459:6,16,

17 4462:1,15 4470:8 4483:14

4487:12 4507:6 4516:11 4517:21 4521:20 4523:25 4524:7 4525:14, 23 4527:6 4528:7 4535:7 4541:20 4550:16 4555:3.5 4573:11 4574:5. 18.21 4575:12 4588:18 4589:2 4599:8116 4600:6 Suppliers' [15] 4407:22 4414:2 4431:8:20 4432:1,12 4442:10 4450:8 4452:24 4453:16 4526:25 4528:9 4545:5 4550:13 4569:1 supply [5] 4556:17 4559:9 4598:5, 17:22 support [6] 4413:5 4444:11 4466: 4 4548:16 4555:10 4603:17 supported [4] 4442:15 4550:4 4563:25 4583:2 supporting 3 4408:1 4413:23 4580:9 supports [2] 4497:21 4574:19 supposed [3] 4410:4 4483:4 4557: surcharge [2] 4539:14.18 surprise [1] 4454:2 survey [84] 4406:23 4407:13,18,23 4413:6 4426:1 4435:21,21,22 4436:6 4437:9,11 4438:11 4441: 12,19 4442:8,25 4443:20 4444:15, 19 4446:23 4447:9,22 4448:1,6,25 4452:5 4461:18 4462:19 4465:15 4470:22 4471:7 13,21 4472:1,15, 23 4474:14 4482:24 4483:12 4484:14 4485:3,5,19 4491:3,7,8,9 4523:12 4528:23,24 4554:10,22, 25 4556:4,25 4559:5,5,6 7,8 4561: 19,24 4562:9,20 4564:10,10 4574: 15.17.25 4581:3 4583:3.6.22 4592: 18:4593:4,13,15,23 4598:4 4599: 23 4602:5 4603:22,24 surveying [1] 4483:8 surveys [13] 4407:11 4411:15,21 4470:2 4476:22 4477:2 4482:17 4491:4 12 4554:20,21 4574:11 4593:3 suspect [1]|4413:9 | suspicious [1] 4447:12 SUZANNE [1] 4400:9 switch [2] 4430:16 4488:7 Syndex [3] 4575:12,14,15 syndicated [2] 4459:15 4526:19 synonymous [1] 4452:11 system [50] 4410:17:25 4419:6.20 4439:9\24 4446:2 4449:17 4450: 12 4451:8,11 4472:15,25 4474:9 4486:16 4492:14 4493:5,10,15,23 4494:3 4497:4,16 4504:23 4505: 11,14,18,24 4506:1,2,3,9,20,21,22 4507:10 4508:1,2,7,13,24 4511:21 22 4513:10 4515:18 21 4554:14 4573:5 4578:25 4586:15 system's [1] 4494:23 system-based [2] 4445:19 4450:

systematic [3] 4505:15,17 4523:1 systematically [3] 4472:6 4577:6, systems [72] 4418:25 4422:1 4423: 12 4427:10 4445:16 4447:24 4450:5.17.22 4466:17 4472:10 4473:7.13 4474:6.15 4482:7 4483: 2 4485:13 4486:13 4492:21,24 4494:2,20 4495:4,9,12,14,18,24 4496:16,18 4497:5,8 4498:25 4499:1,2,6 4503:8,16 4504:15 4505:1,2 4506:11,22,25 4512:2,4, 6,10,22 4513:18 4515:11 4570:16 4576:8,11,13,17,21,25 4577:3,5,7, 11,16,20 4578:13 4579:4,6 4589:6, 24 4590:2 4602:21 - 1 т

table [6] 4431:11 4454:9.10.18 4546:6 4574:22 talked [12] 4420:20 4459:8 4468:6 4475:5 4485:4 4498:18 4544:2.15 4582:17 4588:20 4589:23 4602: talks [3] 4592:8 4599:3 4600:22 task [5] 4475:22,23,23 4482:23 4484.5 TBS [14] 4415:2.3.6.9.22 4416:3.14 4417:3 4419:3,18 4425:11 4427:5 4428:3 4561:12 team [2] 4435:24 4554:24 technological [1] 4548:7 technology [2] 4547:13 4587:23 telecast [3] 4432:3 4437:16,17 telecasts [1] 4415:13 televised [1] 4572:19 Television [84] 4401:18 4402:13 4406:25 4407:8 4419:13 4421:20 4423:2 4435:15 4440:15,21,23 4441:22 4458:4.5 4460:22 4461: 12 4463:21 4464:5,7 4466:7 4469: 24 4470:3,10,12,21 4471:4,8,17 4472:6,7,14,16,19,24 4473:4,8,24 4476:1,8 4478:24,25 4482:22 4483:3,6,14,22,24 4484:2,16 4485: 2 4491:14 4495:1 4516:12 4526: 23 4531:17,18 4538:1 4541:1,3 **4555**:11 **4572**:18,19 **4578**:4,7 **4580**:5,14,16,18,21,22 **4581**:8,13 4582:1 4583:2 4584:5,17,23 4586: 2,6 4595:16,17,19 4604:4,12 Television's [10] 4464:12,15 4468: 22 4469:17 4471:8 4473:22 4476: 14 4581:4 4582:16.22 Television-only [2] 4472:10 4485: tells [5] 4497:1,15 4500:3 4504:25 4590:1

temper [1] 4592:12

4595:8 4596:1

ten [10] 4414:8 4464:2 4525:8

4532:20 4563:3,11,11 4578:5

tends [2] 4426:5 4510:22

tennis [2] 4436:11,15 Tenth [1] 4402:19 term [3] 4422:5 4484:11 4582:10 terms [17] 4419:16 4442:7 4451:15 4460:20 4499:15 4513:2 4514:2 4520:11 4535:23,24 4540:12 4567:8 4570:11 4576:20 4590:13, terribly [2] 4420:6 4461:9 test [6] 4522:25 4523:6,7,9 4591: 21.23 testified [21] 4418:11 4454:25 4464:19 4465:24 4468:25 4484:7 4541:12,13 4542:10,16 4546:21 4547:10 4559:10,11 4563:12 4578:17 4581:7 4587:21 4596:12 4602:1 4603:16 testify [3] 4439:21 4547:16 4549:2 testifying [1] 4515:7 testimonies [1] 4535:14 testimony [47] 4414:7 4416:24 4417:14,21 4418:16 4419:12 4420:13 4422:9 4449:17 4450:4 4455:16 4467:8 4500:13,15,16,16, 17,23,24 4501:3,4 4502:20 4503: 19 4509:3,5,13,19 4510:24 4511:9 4512:13 4516:9 4526:14 4543:13, 20 4544:2 4546:6 4548:3 4551:1 4554:4,8 4559:2 4560:22 4579:14 **4592:1 4594:21 4602:20 4603:**3 testing [3] 4521:25 4522:1,3 tests [3] 4521:11,12 4564:5 Thanks [1] 4596:9 themselves [13] 4417:12 4447:1 4452:17 4453:18 4457:8 4475:6 4495:13 4513:12 4533:5 4558:2 4565:24 4590:7 4592:19 theoretical [1] 4527:24 theory [12] 4408:2 4413:20 4414: 19 4420:3,7 4425:5 4426:18 4429: 10 4443:12 4478:23 4503:16 4600:4 there's [19] 4525:13 4534:6 4535: 5 4541:2 4542:22 4543:7 4544:12 4545:1 4550:22 4551:10 4559:2 4564:24 4565:17 4567:18 4569:9 4580:12 4587:8 4600:24 4601:20 therefore [8] 4462:1 4493:19 4519: 8,11 4549:25 4575:14 4586:11 4600:3 they'll [1] 4565:25 they've [1] 4470:9 thin [1] 4600:5 thinking [9] 4429:13 4435:24 4436:1 4438:15 4474:22 4480:1 4490:20 4538:8 4561:5 thinks [3] 4429:14 4430:23 4498: third [4] 4408:8 4455:8,14 4491:3 though [16] 4422:5 4425:17 4486: 13 4498:18,22 4499:5 4510:4

20 4566:16,23 4568:9 4583:4 thoughtful [1] 4524:3 three [13] 4407:24 4412:8 4413:14 4442:5 4478:23 4479:2 4488:3,11, 13 4546:11 4562:8 4563:22 4594: three-decade [1] 4411:22 threshold [1] 4594:1 throughout [2] 4432:20 4440:25 thrown [1] 4411:2 timeline [1] 4606:3 tiny [2] 4426:24 4427:4 TNT [4] 4420:12 4425:11 4427:6 4428:3 Toby [3] 4602:23,24 4603:2 today [9] 4412:20 4442:3 4488:19 4490:13,25 4572:20 4595:7 4597: 17 4603:17 today's [1] 4460:4 together [9] 4419:4 4424:18 4428: 18 4438:18 4467:22 4473:21 **4480**:20 **4483**:2 **4553**:15 tonnage [1] 4420:5 took [8] 4411:22 4478:22 4545:13 4564:3,11 4573:14 4587:12 4589: 19 tool [3] 4411:10,11 4521:18 top [8] 4413:15,15 4417:15 4418: 10 4420:15 4427:6 4428:4 4447: 14 top-loaded [1] 4568:25 total [16] 4415:9 4455:3 4462:10. 13 4472:12 4496:20 4506:23 4507:5,12 4513:18 4545:25 4550: 19,20,21 4551:21 4571:14 totaled [1] 4415:19 totally [1] 4573:7 touched [1] 4467:18 towards [5] 4480:18 4510:18 4576:1 4580:20 4581:13 transacting [1] 4532:16 transaction [4] 4530:7 4539:12, 20 4542:20 transactions [4] 4527:9 4535:17, 19 4536:9 transcript [5] 4455:19 4456:7 4579:13 4602:4 4608:4 transformation [1] 4500:7 transformed [3] 4506:18 4519:2,5 transgression [1] 4524:18 translated [1] 4514:8 translates [1] 4500:9 transmit [2] 4567:7 4571:4 transparent [1] 4447:2 Trautman [13] 4438:7 4484:24 4544:14 4551:8 4556:14,19 4557: 12 4559:4,10,19 4561:2 4563:12 4602:6 Trautman's [1] 4559:2 treat [1] 4479:8 treats [1] 4486:12 tremendous [1] 4480:21

trend [1] 4451:18 trial [3] 4463:23 4487:15 4524:24 Tribunal [4] 4412:3 4417:25 4489: Tribunals [1] 4489:14 tried [9] 4421:4 4428:18 4439:11. 23 4443:15 4473:11 4480:14 4520:8 4588:21 trigger [1] 4594:1 trip [1] 4585:19 trouble [1] 4525:19 troublesome [2] 4556:24 4561:8 true [6] 4506:4 4516:6 4522:16 4543:19,21 4608:3 truly [5] 4448:13 4466:13,15,20 4605:13 try [12] 4421:12 4432:21 4433:11 4453:1 4482:19 4492:12 4502:14 **4511:**8 **4526:**2,3 **4534:**24 **4585:**13 trying [15] 4410:17 4412:8 4424:12 4425:1 4433:4,5 4436:6,8 4456: 13 4493:20,24 4503:3 4512:1 4581:19 4582:4 tuned [2] 4455:23,25 turn [7] 4434:15 4441:3 4444:12 4451:25 4453:1 4478:12 4533:16 turning [1] 4590:16 turns [5] 4513:21 4557:9,13 4566: 9 4584:10 TV [4] 4436:15 4482:1 4547:15 4553:23 twice [1] 4431:18 two [40] 4409:1 4412:7 4425:23,25 4426:18 4432:19 4437:7,16 4438: 17,22,23,24 4439:23 4440:6 4441: 9 4442:13,14 4443:17 4449:14 4451:9 4462:6 4463:8 4467:16 4471:11 4473:16,17 4476:11 4490:1 4491:17 4532:24 4533:21 4536:18 4546:10 4555:19 4562:7, 23 4563:17 4572:7 4583:12 4591: two-tier [1] 4539:15 type [13] 4479:5 4480:3 4481:15 4494:16 4495:17 4496:1 4509:8 4510:13,13 4546:3 4563:8 4580: 21 4598:1 types [8] 4478:24 4480:4 4485:16 4559:22 4560:6 4565:24 4582:15 4590:20 typical [1] 4437:22 typically [1] 4423:18 U

U.S [7] 4478:24 4481:21,24,25 4483:8,10 4484:15 ultimate [2] 4446:10 4450:25 ultimately [6] 4421:16 4442:18 4492:16 4522:10 4533:8 4603:6 umbrella [1] 4526:16 unadjusted [2] 4408:11 4409:4 unaware [1] 4428:23 unbowed [1] 4526:7

April 24, 2018 uncertainty [1] 4468:21 unconcerned [1] 4573:7 uncorrected [4] 4455:18 4552:6, 18.19 under [26] 4415:21 4418:7 4469: 13,22 4480:15,16 4482:25 4486: 12,15 4488:20 4517:22 4521:22 4526:15 4530:1 4532:16 4534:17 4536:22 4554:25 4557:24 4558: 10,20,23,25 4564:25,25 4574:10 underlaying 🗓 4443:12 understand [24] 4405:6 4410:12 4418:21 4425:13 4430:15 4435:1 4456:2 4481:11 4493:16,17 4494: 6 4502:15 4504:11,18 4508:14,18 4541:24 4554:20 4557:14 4568:2 4573:9 4576:9 4578:23 4579:3 understanding [4] 4522:14 4530: 22 4533:15 4561:3 understands [1] 4542:6 understood [3] 4433:21 4527:7 4546:24 undertake [1] 4484:24 undervalue [1] 4555:4 unduplicated [2] 4518:5,10 unfortunately [2] 4411:25 4417: ungodly [1] 4596:19 unique [12] 4479:22 4480:2,6,7,12 **4481**:12,15 **4482**:2,9,12 **4485**:23 UNITED [3] 4400:1 4423:2 4482:4 Universal [1] 4526:18 universe [1] 4577:5 universities [1] 4421:25 Univision [1] 4587:18 unknown [1] 4446:7 unless [9] 4434:16 4463:16 4478: 2 4489:25 4491:1 4535:5 4538:12, 17 4600:24 Unlike [4] 4446:16 4521:9,11 4594: unlikely [2] 4436:10 4574:14 unlimited [1] 4479:20 unnatural [1] 4484:11 unobserved [1] 4468:9 unquestionably [1] 4437:24 unreasonable [1] 4551:19 unreliable 8 4453:23 4471:23 4474:3 4475:1,4 4529:2 4550:1 4553:2 unsubstantiated [2] 4425:6 4586: unsuccessful [1] 4453:1 until [5] 4413:9 4485:6 4564:11,17, unusual [2] 4479:7 4549:5 unworkable [1] 4411:3 up [46] 4408:16 4413:5 4415:19 4420:12 4426:7 4427:22,23 4430:

4543:13 4548:16 4556:1 4565:6,

11 4432:4,23 4437:21 4440:10

4450:6 4460:9 4473:13 4475:10

4476:13 4479:12 4486:7,9 4488:3 4494:15 4498:4 4501:23 4502:6 4503:14 4504:2 4507:25 4508:1 **4514**:12 **4525**:14 **4528**:4 **4537**:25 4540:11 4545:13 4547:21 4549: 15.17 4555:7.15 4572:4.7 4578:21 4595:14 4597:1 4598:19 upward [1] 4486:22 urge [6] 4439:4 4441:16 4486:18 **4527:**22 **4528:**2 **4579:**12 urged [1] 4527:19 urging [1] 4441:11 usable [5] 4445:18 4453:19 4455: 18 4519:10 4593:23 usage [1] 4547:15 useful [7] 4420:4,6 4444:20 4446: 21 4457:3 4465:3 4578:18 usefulness [1] 4491:8 uses [6] 4473:25 4498:3 4506:10, 11.13.16 using [15] 4429:17 4445:11 4448:9 4457:24 4458:25 4466:4 4479:17 **4486**:25 **4500**:22 **4522**:18 **4544**: 23 4549:19 4561:10 4563:9 4577:

V

valid [4] 4443:9,13 4466:8 4561:24 validity [3] 4556:10 4562:14,21 valuable [7] 4426:15 4445:25 4449:25 4504:10 4518:12 4569:5, 12 valuation [6] 4464:10 4475:9

4484:8 4509:16 4579:8 4592:14 valuations [2] 4579:10 4593:21 value [177] 4406:21 4408:3,7,13 4409:5,20,22 4410:2 4412:13 4413:21 4414:5,10,14 4416:9,11, 14 4420:6,18,25 4421:3,8 4424:13, 22.24 4425:5.24 4428:20 4435:5. 13,23,25 4440:3 4449:2 4452:22 4453:3,7 4456:14 4464:11 4465:4, 5 4466:2,5,24 4471:6 4477:13,15 4479:15 4484:14 4491:20,23 4492:16,23 4493:8,10,12,13,14,18 22 4495:6,8,10,15 4496:17,25 4497:7,8,10,11,13,22 4498:2,3,8, 15,17,21 4499:6,11,13,13,16,17, 20 4500:4,9,11 4503:10,25 4504:9, 21 4505:7 4508:13,17 4509:8,24 **4510:**1,3,6,12,14,19,22 **4511:**14, 15 4512:5,8 4514:20 4515:1,5,13, 14,22 4518:15 4527:6,21,24 4528: 12.25 4529:3 4530:24 4532:5 **4533**:6,11,23 **4539**:5 **4540**:3,6,8 **4541:**5 **4544:**17 **4545:**3,6,20 **4554:** 15 4555:17,22 4557:11 4558:8,11, 15,17,19,22,25 4559:4,17 4560:5, 9,17 4561:9 4566:21 4567:14 4569:12,22,25 4570:12,22 4574:2, 7 4576:12,20 4579:2,5,6 4581:4, 16 4584:11 4586:12 4588:19 4590:9 4592:24 4594:20 4599:19

4601:23 4603:19 4604:10 valued [4] 4469:22 4475:15 4495: 24 4580:17 values [11] 4436:8,12 4444:21 4447:14 4467:2,2 4496:14,14 4498:19 4535:18 4598:1 valuing [6] 4477:5 4503:17 4512: 23 4513:1,3 4533:13 vantage [1] 4592:16 variability [3] 4465:1 4468:16 4591:13 variable [7] 4506:17 4519:1,5,24, 25 4591:2 4605:2 variables [7] 4446:7,18 4492:19 4520:1 4545:19 4546:4 4591:14 variation [8] 4445:17 4468:7 4496: 6,11,16,24 4515:1 4578:16 variations [3] 4496:18 4505:11 4512:17 variety [1] 4583:23 various [9] 4410:19 4422:2 4470: 17 4471:25 4534:2 4542:6 4545: 14 4579:19 4586:17 vary [3] 4506:1,9,21 varying [2] 4505:15,16 vast [1] 4571:18 Verizon [2] 4472:15,17 version [2] 4594:11 4595:24 versions [1] 4489:8 versus [6] 4423:13 4457:14 4484: 15,16 4511:21 4567:12 vests [1] 4529:6

Viacom [1] 4526:17 Vicky [1] 4406:1 VICTOR [1] 4403:9 view [22] 4407:12 4414:1 4419:10 4438:1 4468:22 4482:10 4494:23 4498:16 4528:20 4533:17 4540: 17 4545:2,19 4547:11,24 4549:13, 13 4554:7 4555:16 4573:24,25 4584:11 viewed [4] 4477:15 4581:7 4586: 17,19 viewer [2] 4473:1 4517:22 viewers [1] 4422:15 viewership 6 4423:14,17 4566:1 4570:7 4573:17,22 viewing [174] 4407:20 4408:2,7,11 **4409**:4,11,21,21 **4411**:8,9,21,24 4412:4.13.18 4413:2.21 4414:4.10. 14 **4415**:17 **4416**:16 **4420**:2,7,17. 24 4421:1,2,3,8 4422:3,5,7,10,12, 23 4424:23 4425:5,24 4426:8 4428:19 4429:1,6,7,11,18 4430:2 4432:7 4433:6,11,16,17,18 4434:7 10,11 4442:10 4452:4,7,12,13,18, 21 4453:2,5,23 4454:6,10,14,18, 19 4455:1,3,6,22 4456:13 4457:12 13,15,16,23 4458:11,17 4459:10, 13,18,25 4460:9,15,17 4469:20 4470:8 4476:13,15,18,19 4477:10, 12,16 4490:23 4526:2,9 4528:9,10

4540:17,18,19,23,24 4541:12,15,
20,22 4542:11,12,17,17,21,24
4543:16,25 4544:9,10,13,16,18,23
4545:1,12,24,25 4546:8,16,25
4547:20 4548:2|25 4549:3,7,10,18,
23 4550:6,20,20,21 4551:22 4553:
15,19,22 4572:22 4573:14,15,24
4574:5 4586:7,13 4587:24 4588:8,
11,12,15,18 4589:11 4593:11,25
4602:10,12,16,22 4603:9,19 4604:
6,20
viewing-related [1]4441:17

viewing-related (1) 4441:17 views (1) 4526:1 vision (1) 4541:2 volatility (3) 4446:12 4465:1 4591:

24 VOLUME (5) 4400:20 4415:10 11

VOLUME [5] 4400:20 4415:10,11 4580:25 4586:20

W waived [2] 4524:1,2 Waldfogel [15] 4444:17,19 4446: 14,16 4463:1 4465:8 4479:13 4495:17 4497:21 4505:7 4506:24 4508:14 4509:8 4514:19 4605:5 walk [2] 4441:23 4461:15 walking [1] 4470:23 wanted [7] 4488:13,17 4506:15 4541:18 4564:20 4595:7,17 WARLEY [1] 4404:4 warmup [1] 4474:17 warrant [1] 4437:8 warrants [2] 4601:19,20 Washington [9] 4400:16 4401:10, 16,24 4402:10,20 4403:6,20 4404: watch [3] 4422:19,20 4572:19 watched [2] 4431:17,19 watches [1] 4573:8 watching [4] 4422:14,25 4541:6 4572:21 way [44] 4422:1 4424:10 4428:15 4429:25 4432:2,11,13 4443:25 4445:18 4451:2:4452:8,9 4462:3 4477:24 4481:14 4483:10 4498:5 4503:5:4505:15,17 4508:14,19,23 4509:7,20,21,22 4515:22 4519:7 **4520**:12 **4525**:13 **4532**:8,21,23 4538:10 4542:4 4543:9 4552:20 4557:6 4566:19 4568:14 4593:22 **4605:**3.5 ways [5] 4443:20 4449:14 4471:11 4515:20 4583:23 weaker [1] 4571:8 wealth [1] 4513:20 week [1] 4553:24 weigh 3 4414:7,10.11 weight [16] 4407:12 4410:4 4413:2 4421:9,16 4434:9 4435:2 4438:2 4441:16 4452:6 4456:12 4552:5 4573:10 4574:15 4593:12 4603:6 weighted [2] 4510:18 4568:11

well-founded [2] 4457:5,6 WGNA [45] 4431:1;7,14,17,21 4432:2,3,7,13 4435:6 4436:25 4437:2,14 4438:9 4453:21 4455:5 4456:4,10 4462:1,6 4466:18 4472: 21 4473:1,5 4475:10,19,21 4476: 23.25 4477:5.8 4545:10 4549:23 **4550**:14,15,23 **4551**:1,5,8,12,14, 17,21,22 4582:18 WGNA's [1] 4455:1 WGNA-only [1] 4473:7 whatever [9] 4429:15 4483:18 4500:2 4512:10 4532:22,23 4543: 10 4558:22 4570:7 whatsoever [2] 4424:2 4456:12 wheel [1] 4490:8 Whereas [2] 4513:20 4571:6 Whereupon [1] 4606:9 whether [32] 4409:10 4420:2 4449: 11 4466:17 4471:13 4483:17 4484:22 4506:6 4527:20.22 4531: 11,13,16 4533:3,4 4538:25 4541:5 4544:4,11 4551:10 4553:4 4561:5 **4565**:10,25 **4566**:1 **4572**:25 **4573**: 2,7,20 4586:16 4591:23 4597:19 whole [6] 4448:23 4477:20 4483: 22 4484:7 4569:9 4598:2 wholeheartedly [1] 4555:10 whoops [1] 4423:10 wide [1] 4465:10 widely [1] 4431:1 wildly [1] 4450:6 will [65] 4407:15 4410:12 4411:3 4414:22 4415:6 4431:24 4432:3 4438:19 4440:12 4441:16 4442: 25 4443:1.6 4462:11.12 4463:17 4467:18 4476:24 4477:18 4478:3, 4 4487:11 4489:3 4490:10.14 4491:3,21 4497:25 4498:11 4500: 23,23 4506:9 4507:16 4511:6 4513:18,19 4516:10 4523:8 4524: 7,19 4526:2,16,18 4532:16 4535: 19 4536:1,3,4,6,10,16 4538:19,19 4539:7 4543:9 4544:25 4552:11, 24 4572:9,17 4574:4 4582:10 4604:4 4606:1,6 willing [1] 4579:7 willingness [10] 4513:4,8,9,13,15, 17 **4514**:7 **4556**:16 **4559**:6 **4598**: willingness-to-pay [1] 4513:6 wind [1] 4549:17 Winthrop [1] 4404:6 wish [4] 4539:11 4585:21 4596:11, 14 wished [2] 4546:24,24 withdraw [1] 4517:21 withdrawn [1] 4454:2 within [18] 4415:13 4438:4 4445: 15 4446:1 4476:7,9 4482:19 4506:

weighting [1] 4508:15

3 4513:13 4529:16 4534:3.12.15

4544:8 4552:2 4563:13 4574:21

Determination of Cable Royalty Funds

4593:8

without [6] 4450:5 4452:19 4511:9

4541:5 **4549**:19 **4559**:9

witness [6] 4407:5 4502:24 4542:

9,16 4544:18,22

witnesses [11] 4413:24 4414:1 4422:10 4437:5 4442:2 4464:19 4521:10 4540:18 4548:21 4555:

19 4603:15

WJZ [3] 4455:20,24,25

woman's [1] 4602:21

wonder [1] 4476:14

wonderful [1] 4481:2 wondering [1] 4501:9

word [5] 4408:15 4418:15 4493:11,

14 4578:13

wording [1] 4474:19

words [6] 4468:15 4471:14 4476:

12 **4502**:9 **4503**:3 **4528**:2

work [19] 4443:24 4451:14 4458:

23 4526:9 4530:15,22 4531:4

4532:10 4533:3 4534:23 4540:5

4544:15 **4545:**12 **4551:**25 **4556:**4

4557:8 **4582:**11 **4587:**17 **4600:**12

worked [6] 4421:23 4443:9,25

4541:11 4587:16 **4596:**6

working [1] 4546:19

works [17] 4529:9,11,15,21,24

4530:9 **4531:**4,4,5,19,22 **4532:**13

4533:4,7 **4535:**12,21 **4548:**17

worse 3 4558:21 4583:13,23 worth 3 4422:20 4484:23 4526:

15

wrap [2] 4452:17 4572:7

wrestling [1] 4436:2

written [3] 4490:6 4500:15,16

wrongly [1] 4558:18

Х

XX [1] 4400:20

4.4 4445.40

year [20] 4411:1 4415:10 4437:7 4458:3,5 4459:12 4466:18 4469:9

4473:22 4475:12,12 4545:9,21

4553:8,12,21,25,25 **4564**:12 **4584**:

year's [1] 4443:15

year-by-year[1] 4446:12

year-to-year [1] 4446:12

years [29] 4417:23 4420:23 4434:

18,20 4435:19 4437:16 4439:11

4443:25 4445:10 4453:5 4458:15,

16 **4465**:4 **4471**:20 **4482**:16 **4523**:

2 4532:20,25 4541:11 4542:10

4546:19,22 4548:5 4563:19 4564:

2 4587:14,17,17 4591:24 vesterday [1] 4411:25

York [1] 4566:13

Yorkers [1] 4433:2

yourself [1] 4601:24

7

zero [13] 4433:16,18 4434:6 4449: 19 4459:13 4498:4,17 4548:21,22 4553:14,17 4571:24 4591:5 zeros [5] 4433:23,24 4434:3,4 4548:24 zone [6] 4430:23 4454:25 4477:18

4480:5 4481:13 4552:3

Heritage Reporting Corporation (202) 628-4888

